

FIFTY CENTS

CATHOLIC MIND

May-June, 1960

An Interfaith Dialogue
Have We Gone Soft?
Church, Laity and Apostolate
How the Reds Lost Kerala

ARTICLES • PAPAL AND EPISCOPAL STATEMENTS • ADDRESSES

T

V

W

CATHOLIC MIND

58th Year • An America Press Publication

EDITOR
Thurston N. Davis, S.J.

•

EXECUTIVE EDITOR
Vincent S. Kearney, S.J.

•

With the collaboration of
the AMERICA staff

•

EDITORIAL OFFICE
329 West 108 Street,
New York 25, N.Y.

•

GENERAL MANAGER
William Holub

•

BUSINESS OFFICE
920 Broadway
New York 10, N.Y.

•

One Year-\$3.00

Two Years-\$5.00

Foreign-\$3.50 Yearly

•

MAY-JUNE, 1960
VOL. LVIII, No. 1149

ARTICLES AND ADDRESSES

The Second Vatican Council	196	J. A. Hardon, S.J. <i>Catholic World</i>
A DIALOGUE:		
1. A Lutheran Looks at the Ecumenical Movement	210	B. von Schenk
2. An Orthodox Views Reunion	219	A. Schmemann
3. In Our Love Is Our Hope	223	G. Weigel, S.J.
Have We Gone Soft?	229	<i>New Republic</i>
A Forgotten Letter		
Birth Control and Foreign Aid	239	<i>Worldview</i>
Clericalism in America	244	J. B. Mannion
The Businessman	253	W. Seavey Joyce, S.J.
How the Reds Lost Kerala	258	<i>Civiltà Cattolica</i>

DOCUMENTATION

Freedom of the Press	268	John XXIII
Censorship	274	John XXIII
Foreign Aid	277	Catholic Association for International Peace
World Refugee Year	283	National Catholic Welfare Conference

JOY IN THE FAITH

Meditations

by AUGUSTE VALENSIN, S.J.

The original French edition was hailed as one of the best Catholic books of that year in France.

"Enchanting book, irresistibly readable and purchasable." EMMANUEL

"Sisters will surely like this book . . ." SISTER FORMATION BULLETIN

"This book makes excellent spiritual reading . . ." THE CRITIC

"A refreshing book, drawn from the meditations of an unusual personality, arresting in its sheer simplicity." DOMINICANA
435 pages, cloth \$4.00



SOME SCHOOLS OF CATHOLIC SPIRITUALITY

by JEAN GAUTIER, S.S.

A handbook for persons already aware of the broad differences among the various forms of spiritual discipline (Benedictine, Dominican, Jesuit, Salesian, Oratorian, Carmelite, etc.) but not well acquainted with the more subtle ones.

"Extraordinarily valuable and stimulating."

WORSHIP

"It now seems difficult to set forth such matters without consulting this book which is an excellent working tool."

DANIEL-ROPS

384 pages, cloth \$4.75

MEDITATIONS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT—The Narratives

by GASTON BRILLET, C.or.

This first volume in a series of four ("••THE PSALMS, ••PROPHECY, ••WISDOM, to be published this year) is based on the historical accounts. Father Brillet has chosen the richest pericopes to help us savor the timeless doctrine: Our relationship with God, God's attitude toward us, toward the church, and our own attitude toward Him.
239 pages, cloth \$3.50

LIFE THROUGH THE CROSS

by MARCEL BORIES

In seven different ways of the Cross—each one based on one of the Sacraments—the author has with beauty and skill placed many of the truths about the Sacraments within the pattern of simple, practical considerations for the fourteen stations.

"This booklet is excellent . . . its spread will greatly enrich the prayer-life of all that will use it."

RIGHT REV. MARTIN B. HELLRIEGEL

111 pages, paper \$1.25

THE COMPLETE PRAYERS OF HIS HOLINESS PIUS XII

translated from the original texts by Alastair Guinan

176 pages, 3 photos, paper \$1.50

From your bookstore or

DESCLEE

C O M P A N Y , I N C .

280 BROADWAY, NEW YORK 7, N. Y. • TOURNAI • PARIS • ROME

IN THIS ISSUE

- In view of the forthcoming ecumenical council called by John XXIII, JOHN A. HARDON, S.J., a professor of theology at West Baden College, probes the significance and meaning of the general council in the life of the Church. He speculates on the possible agenda to be prepared for the deliberations to begin, according to present plans, in 1963.
- Complementing Father Hardon's article, this issue also presents a symposium on the ecumenical movement by a Lutheran clergyman, a Russian Orthodox priest and a Jesuit theologian. REV. BERTHOLD VON SCHENK writes in the hope of giving Catholics a clearer statement of the Lutheran position on the reunion of churches. VERY REV. ALEXANDER SCHMEMANN reflects on what Russian Orthodoxy would consider to be the "proper context" for further discussions of reunion. GUSTAVE WEIGEL, S.J., approaches the problem from a Catholic viewpoint. Though all write in a positive vein, none see reunion around the corner.
- THURSTON N. DAVIS, S.J., explores the nation's "spiritual flabbiness" and points to the need for a return to a "public philosophy"—"a common conception of law and order," in the words of the noted columnist Walter Lippmann, "which possesses universal validity."
- As the religious issue continues to intrude itself into national politics, Catholics and non-Catholics alike will find the FORGOTTEN LETTER of PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT interesting reading.
- Should foreign aid include U.S. Government-sponsored birth control programs? JAMES O'GARA, managing editor of the *Commonweal*, answers No. The Catholic bishops, he points out, had no alternative save to oppose *as public policy* any program which violates the Catholic conscience.
- JOHN B. MANNION talks frankly of the survival of clericalism in the American Church.

THE CATHOLIC MIND, May-June, 1960. Volume LVIII, No. 1149. Published bi-monthly by The America Press, 920 Broadway, New York 10, N.Y. Subscription postpaid; yearly \$3.00; Canada and foreign \$3.50; single copy 50 cents. Second Class Postage paid at New York, N.Y.



Taken collectively, the councils of the Church are a synthesis of Catholic teaching on faith and morals and the best evidence we have that Christ founded a living society that grows and adapts itself to human needs without compromising its divine mission.

The Second Vatican Council*

JOHN A. HARDON, S.J.
Professor of Theology
West Baden College

IN APPROACHING a subject as complex as the forthcoming ecumenical council of the Catholic Church, the first thing to do is give some reasons for speaking on the topic at all. Why talk about something that is still a few years in the offing, and what, in any case, seems to concern only Catholics and among them only professional theologians and churchmen?

The fact is that the second Vatican Council concerns not only Catholics but the whole Christian world;

indeed, the spiritual welfare of mankind. Although formal deliberations may not be held before 1963, in a true sense the council has already begun in the minds and hearts of millions of persons who share the hopes of Pope John XXIII for a revitalization of Catholic faith and practice and a possible reunion (or at least renewed sense of solidarity) of all those who bear the Christian name. On both levels will be needed light and courage, derived from human effort, no doubt, but

*An address to a regional meeting of the Society of Catholic Teachers of Sacred Doctrine, University of Dayton, Dayton, O., November 28, 1959.

under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. This, in turn, calls for prayer which needs enlightened motivation that I hope in some slight measure to supply.

What Is a General Council?

Broadly speaking, councils of the Church are authorized gatherings of bishops for the purpose of discussing ecclesiastical problems with a view to passing decrees on the matter under deliberation. If all the bishops are called to participate and actually represent the Catholic world, the assembly is called ecumenical which means universal; if only part of the hierarchy is invited, the council is particular. The latter may be plenary or provincial, depending on whether a single provincial area, like the dioceses of Ohio, or a whole country sponsors the gathering. A point to note is that councils, even on a provincial basis, enjoy juridical authority in religious matters that is distinct from the legislative powers of individual bishops. In this respect also councils differ from episcopal conferences which are not, as such, legislative assemblies.

General councils are named after the place where they are held. To date there have been twenty such in the history of the Church, the first occurring in 325 A.D. at Nicea in Bithynia, Asia Minor. As a matter of record, 318 prelates and the Emperor Constantine took part in the Council of Nicea, and we even have the names of the papal legates who presided: Hosius, Bishop of

Cordova, with Vitus and Vincent, two Roman priests. At Nicea the council condemned Arianism which denied the divinity of Christ.

The last ecumenical council was held at the Vatican in 1870, at which 700 prelates clarified the relation of faith and reason, condemned the errors of pantheism and rationalism, and defined the Roman Primacy and papal infallibility.

According the norms of Canon Law, it is impossible to have an ecumenical council which has not been convoked by the Roman Pontiff. By divine right only residential bishops are asked to participate. But ecclesiastical privilege now extends the invitation also to cardinals and titular bishops, abbots and heads of monastic orders and generals of exempt religious congregations of men. All the foregoing will have a deliberative voice and vote in the next general council. Theologians and others participate only in a consultative capacity.

What about non-Catholic participants? In a published statement made in Rome by Cardinal Tardini, Papal Secretary of State, since ecumenical councils are internal functions of the Catholic Church, only those can actively promote its operation who profess Roman Catholicism. However, the Cardinal explained, this does not exclude others from attending the council in the quality of observers. Moreover, the precise degree and manner of non-Catholic participation "is being tentatively studied."

To understand the authority of a

general council, we must avoid two extremes: neither vesting it with rights that merge on the old heresy of conciliarism, nor so delimiting its powers that it becomes only a mouthpiece of the papacy.

We might compare the council with our own American Congress. Both assemblies are representative of the people, elected in one case and ordained or consecrated for their office in the other. In both sessions, conciliar and congressional, free discussion is permitted and encouraged, and opinions are put to vote. An absolute majority is required for approval at a general council; and the same for Congress, except in a few cases provided by the Constitution.

But here the parallel ends. Unlike any parliament or secular congress, councils of the Church are assemblies of the Catholic hierarchy as witnesses and interpreters of the faith of their people. United with the Pope and under his authority, the bishops possess the gift of infallibility in their final and definitive decrees on matters of faith and morals.

Since the Vatican Council defined papal infallibility, the suspicion may arise that the bishops, even in ecumenical session, are supernumeraries; that their only function is to counsel and advise the Pope, and nothing more. This is not true. Certainly papal primacy is one of jurisdiction and not mere honor. Yet this does not exclude bishops from the government of the Church. Indeed, by divine mandate it cannot. Christ established the Church as a hierarchical society, consisting of the Chris-

tian faithful under the leadership of the hierarchy, which exists on two levels—the bishops as successors of the Apostles, and the Pope as successor of St. Peter.

The bishops, united with the Pope, participate in the Church's infallibility, and at the forthcoming council will be specially assisted by the Holy Spirit, to avoid doctrinal error in dealing with problems that face the Church and reaching solutions demanded by the will of God. Unquestionably the acts and decrees of the council must be confirmed by the Pope to become binding on the faithful; but in all the conciliar deliberations which precede the papal approval, it is Catholic teaching that the bishops, under the Roman Pontiff, are divinely guided to preserve and interpret the deposit of Christian revelation.

Possible Agenda

I should like to preface my remarks on the possible agenda for the council by saying that my observations are largely, though not entirely, speculative. They are speculative because until the questionnaires sent by the Pope to the bishops are returned, *no one* can have a definite idea of what subjects will be treated. All the questionnaires have not yet been answered and consequently a definitive prospectus for the council still remains undecided. According to the Vatican Secretary of State, about 2,700 prelates have been interrogated, and answers received (as of November 1, 1959) from 1,600. Incidentally 80 per cent

of the residential bishops have already made their replies. But the actual tabulation of what matters are to be dealt with and in what order, is still in the ante-preparatory stage.

However, we are not left entirely in the air on certain areas of interest which many persons believe are likely, if not certainly, to be treated at the council.

Church and State Relations. There is good reason for believing that high in priority among the possible agenda will be the relations of the Catholic Church to the civil government. World communism has created ecclesiastical problems that have no counterpart in Christian history. Without compromising on her principles, the Church must give directions to the millions of Catholics who are suffering under Communist domination.

Unfortunately, many people outside of Russia and the satellite countries are still fascinated by the Marxist Utopia. The council may undertake (as the Popes have done since 1864) to expose and publicize the utter incompatibility of Christianity and communism, unlike the Evanston Assembly in 1954 that obscured the issue by its practical silence on the Red persecution of the Catholic Church and its fear that anti-Communist hysteria might be a greater evil than communism.

Closer to home, a much agitated question which the council may undertake to solve is the problem of tolerance by Catholics of their non-Catholic fellow citizens. Is this tolerance only a matter of expedience

or does it rest on absolute principles? Should Catholics legally tolerate heresy in their midst only to avoid greater evils, but once in power, restrict the exercise, if not the profession, of what from the Catholic viewpoint is a heretical religion? Or, as Maritain would have it, "Even if one single citizen dissented from the religious faith of all the people, his right to dissent could by no means be infringed upon by the State in a Christianly inspired modern democratic society . . . Catholics who are ready to give their lives for freedom do not cling to these assertions as a matter of expediency, but as a matter of moral obligation or of justice" (*Man and the State*, p. 181). Catholic theologians may be found on both sides, with perhaps the majority in America favoring Maritain's theory, that tolerance is not merely a hypothesis (until Catholics can change the *status quo*), but a thesis, where tolerance yields to political fellowship, while recognizing theologically that only Catholicism has the full possession of revealed truth.

Bishops and the Holy See. Another area of possible concern for the council is to insure an efficient operation of the Church's huge juridical structure, while keeping pace with the growth of Catholic membership and the complexities of modern life. At the close of the last century, the Catholic world population was estimated at 280 million; the most recent figure is 520 million, an increase of almost a quarter-billion members in less than sixty years.

Along with numerical growth has been the multiplication of problems, especially in the field of marriage, which call for solution and which in many cases (according to present norms) must be submitted to Rome for adjudication. Add to this details of administering to the ordinary needs of more than 2,000 ecclesiastical jurisdictions, including 1,600 residential sees and 500 mission territories, and we get some idea of the problems this creates for a centralized organization like the Catholic Church.

It seems not unlikely that some plan will be worked out by the council to both guarantee the Church's Roman solidarity and at the same time facilitate the handling of diocesan and national problems on a diocesan or national level. Whatever solution is finally reached, it will certainly be along the lines indicated by the late Pius XII, who described bishops as united by a very special bond to the divine Head of the Mystical Body.

As far as their own diocese is concerned, each bishop as a true shepherd feeds the flock entrusted to him and rules it in the name of Christ. Yet in exercising this office, they are not altogether independent, but subordinate to the Roman Pontiff, although enjoying the ordinary power of jurisdiction which they receive directly from the same Supreme Pontiff (*Mystici corporis*).

The council's problem will be to conserve the existing dependence of the bishops on Rome while expediting the regular business of the

Church with the least red-tapery and delay.

Role of the Laity in the Church. Comparable to the need for an efficient liaison between the bishops and the Holy See is the call for a greater participation of the laity in the Church's liturgy and apostolate.

Since the time of St. Pius X, it has been the constant endeavor of the Holy See to promote a more active sharing of the faithful in the Church's liturgy, especially in the Sacrifice of the Mass. Among other postulata, therefore, the next general council may deal with requests for use of the vernacular beyond the privileges already granted for the administration of the sacraments and in some phases of the Eucharistic ceremonies.

However, it is especially lay cooperation in the Church's apostolate that the council may undertake to promote. For many people Catholic Action is only a kind of adjunct of the Church's evangelism and a temporary expedient to make up for the lack of clergy in a particular area. The council might clarify and settle definitively that the lay apostolate, under the direction of the hierarchy, belongs to the essence of the Church and was so intended by Christ her founder.

As an extension of Catholic Action, serious thought is being given to restoring the diaconate as a permanent way of life, even for married persons in the world. Deacons, we know, were ordained since the first century to assist the Apostles in the work of the ministry, and soon

became the intermediaries between priests and people, with functions and duties that included caring for the altar and the sacred vessels, preaching and baptizing, distributing Holy Communion, preparing converts and catechumens, visiting the sick and those in prison, leading the people at prayer and assisting in liturgical ceremonies. Among saintly deacons who left their mark on Christian history were Lawrence, the martyr, Ephrem the Syrian Doctor of the Church, and St. Francis of Assisi.

Since the Middle Ages, the diaconate has been so entirely regarded as a stage of preparation for the priesthood that, until recent years, interest no longer was attached to its precise duties and privileges. But this attitude is changing. On the home front and especially on the missions, Church leaders feel there is pressing need for restoring the lesser sacred orders, including the diaconate.

A vicar apostolic from Indonesia voiced the opinion of many of his fellow bishops when he expressed the wish that the diaconate might be re-introduced, also for married men, in view of the expansive demands for an auxiliary ministry in modern times. "This concept," said the bishop, "was once a living part of the Church's heritage, and from it the lower orders came into being. It is greatly to be desired that this concept and practice return. There is reason to fear that the Church is lost to some areas because of the scarcity of priests. In addition to the

many factors contributing to a local decline of the Church, it must not be overlooked that a parish or a community which does not function formally, organically, with definite duties and privileges (inside as well as outside the sanctuary) must be lost to the Church. I say with definite duties and privileges according to the principles laid down by the Holy Father [Pius XII]. I believe we place too little confidence in the laity, and precisely in those areas where their role, in our day, is of greater importance than ever" (Wilhelm van Bekkum, *Assisi Papers*, p. 111).

Judging by the interest in this subject among high-ranking prelates and theologians, the council may be asked to establish the diaconate for married and unmarried men as a permanent institution in the Catholic Church.

Further Definition of Papal Infallibility. It may come as something of a surprise that in some circles there is talk of having the council deal with the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. Although purely hypothetical, two possible refinements of the existing Vatican definition are suggested: One to settle a domestic dispute among theologians on papal infallibility as regards truths that are not formally in revelation, also called secondary objects of infallibility. The question is whether the *proximate* motive for such truths is immediately the word of God revealing or only mediately through the teaching authority of the Church.

Another and more practical as-

pect of the problem is the precise binding power of papal pronouncements other than solemn documents like *Munificentissimus Deus* defining Mary's bodily assumption. Ten years ago Pius XII complained that some theologians lightly set aside the doctrine contained in Encyclical Letters on the pretext that the Popes do not exercise in them the supreme power of their teaching authority. He further seemed to equate the Encyclicals with what is technically "the ordinary magisterium" of the Church, which by its nature is irreversible. Yet we know that Encyclicals, as such, are not *ex cathedra* pronouncements on a par with solemn definitions. Hence the value of clarifying norms to distinguish not the subjective levels of adherence which may be assumed among Catholics, but the objective "theological note" or dogmatic hierarchy among various statements emanating from the Holy See.

In the same context is the important question of papal authority to pass judgment in ostensibly temporal matters, and so bind the consciences of the Catholic faithful. Not a small part of the tension in Church and State relationship arises from a misunderstanding of the Catholic position on the essential superiority of the spiritual over the temporal, and the corresponding right which the Church has to defend her spiritual interests when these are endangered or impugned by the secular authority. "We are willing enough to listen to the Church," some might say, "as long as she keeps within

the limits of her own competence, in dealing with the altar and sanctuary, but she has no business dictating policy or giving directions in mundane affairs like capital and labor, or commerce and industry."

More than once in his last years, Pius XII castigated this isolation of the Church to the sacristy, and insisted that as vicegerent of Christ she has the duty and right to speak on secular matters to her children and to all who will listen whenever the spiritual welfare of souls is involved. As custodian of revelation, including the revelation of the natural law, the Church was commissioned by her Founder to interpret this law to the people. The Second Vatican Council may see fit to spell out these principles in further detail. It is said the council will be asked to give moral judgment on total atomic warfare or at least to co-ordinate in a supernatural atmosphere all work for peace based on the fundamentals of morality.

Reunion of Christendom. We have tried to save the best wine for last. All the evidence points to the serious efforts which the council will make to heal the disunity in the Christian world, dating in the East from 1054, when the Oriental churches separated from Rome, and in the West from 1517, the year Martin Luther nailed his theses to the church door of the castle at Wittenberg.

Whatever may be said of other subjects on the agenda, this question does not have to wait for the council to meet before something is done

to solve it. In fact, depending on the earnestness with which people like ourselves examine the problem and strive to solve it in the social and professional ambit in which we live, the future decisions of the council will be correspondingly effective. As a sober reminder, the reunion efforts of the Council of Florence in the fifteenth century remained sterile because the soil of popular opinion had not been properly tilled.

What are the prospects of reunion with Rome for the Dissident Orientals? I believe they are the best in nine hundred years, since the unfortunate Patriarch Caerularius was excommunicated for closing churches of the Latin rite and allowing his chancellor to trample under foot the sacred hosts that were consecrated from unleavened bread.

Much has happened since the great Eastern Schism. Looking for independence from the Pope, the Oriental churches found themselves the unwilling victims of political tyranny: under the Byzantine Emperors in Constantinople, under the Moslems in Asia Minor and southeastern Europe, under the Czars in the Russian Empire and now, most cruelly, under the Red dictators in Moscow. Suffering and persecution have chastened the people and their clergy. The old hostility to Rome has changed to respect and friendliness. At the Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches, the Orthodox delegates were outspoken in their sympathy for the Church of Rome. When Pope John in his

Christmas message referred to Eastern Orthodox Christians as "our dear separated brethren" and declared that he would "pursue humbly but fervently a loving invitation" for their union with Rome, the Orthodox patriarch replied on New Year's Day, expressing joy at the Pope's overture. He said it "would be the dawn of a really new year in Jesus Christ" if such a reunion could be achieved.

The last reunion council at Florence (1439) failed to produce lasting results because the Byzantine Government was opposed to Rome and Orthodox churchmen sided with the political power, which they had vested with final authority in ecclesiastical matters. But today the Soviet rulers in the Kremlin cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be conceded rights in the internal life of the church. This separation of Church and State in Russia, though painful and costly in many ways, may have the salutary effect of allowing Orthodox leaders to consider union with Rome without deference to the Communist Government.

However, two great obstacles stand in the way: primacy and divorce with the right to remarry. According to Catholic teaching, the Roman Pontiff has supreme jurisdiction over the Christian world, transmitted through Peter from Christ Himself. The Orthodox claim that individual bishops, as successors of the Apostles, are the visible heads of the Church and that some bishops, namely the patriarchs, have wider

(but not supreme) authority. They are willing to call the Pope Patriarch of the West, with corresponding primacy of honor, but not supremacy. This is foreseen as the crucial problem that must be solved before the Orthodox will be reunited with Rome.

On a less dogmatic level but equally critical is the growing practice of divorce among the Orthodox. From a sixth century concession of Emperor Justinian, Eastern canonists have built an elaborate set of ways to dissolve marriage: infidelity and dislike between husband and wife, grave sickness and prolonged absence, in fact any reason accepted by the patriarch may cause "moral death" and free the two partners to remarry. Though less publicized than the primacy, the Catholic prohibition of divorce with the right to remarriage is perhaps the greater obstacle to healing the Eastern schism; yet, by the grace of God, within grasp of the Orthodox faithful.

Unfortunately publicity given to the coming council has underplayed the Pope's desire for a return to Catholic unity of the Protestant churches of the world, currently numbering over 200 million members. His statements on the subject, however, leave no room for doubt. Both Orthodox and Protestants are foreseen as the object of papal solicitude and of the council's plans to facilitate their return to Rome.

Yet we must be realistic. Unlike the Orthodox, Protestant churches have retained much less of their

Catholic heritage. Rationalism and liberalism have made deep ravages in the Christian faith. Compare the unqualified supernaturalism in Luther's *Catechism*, Calvin's *Institutes* or the *Journal* of John Wesley with the compromising doctrine of many Protestants today, and we see what has happened to Reformation theology. If we add to this the general acceptance of divorce and birth control, the prospect of ever recalling Protestants to Catholic unity seems more like a dream than even a remote possibility.

That is, naturally speaking. But the past fifty years have witnessed a new phenomenon in the non-Catholic Christian world, conceived and promoted by dedicated Protestant churchmen and popularly called the ecumenical movement, organized under the aegis of the World Council of Churches.

From the earliest years, the shadow of Rome hovered over the beginnings of the future World Council. In 1919, when the founders were canvassing for member churches, they called on Pope Benedict XV and invited his cooperation, which he courteously declined. In 1937, at the opening service of the Edinburgh Conference on Faith and Order, the Archbishop of York told the delegates, "We deeply lament the absence in this collaboration of the great Church of Rome—the Church which more than any other has known how to speak to the nations so that the nations hear." In 1948, at the first assembly of the World Council in Amsterdam, one

of the principal topics of discussion was "The Roman Catholic Church and the Ecumenical Movement." And shortly before the Evanston meeting in 1954, the chairman of the Faith and Order commission frankly said: "That the Church of Rome has not found it possible to take active part in any of the gatherings which we have been used to call ecumenical in spite of the absence of so large a part of the Christian world, is a tragic fact which we have had to accept."

The purpose of the ecumenical movement is to re-establish what Christ Himself desires, unity of faith and worship among those who believe in His name and who look to Him for salvation in the world to come. For more than half a century now, Protestant leaders have been struggling to heal their disunity, and remove what they call the sin of sectarian division among people who profess to follow a Saviour whose parting testimonial at the Last Supper was "that they all may be one."

If we couple these two factors, a desire for unity and a sympathy towards Catholicism, I believe we have a hopeful sign that the Protestant churches are closer to Rome than ever before in their religious history.

The barriers that stand in the way are myriad: a caricature of Catholicism that was born of the Reformation and that still haunts too many of our Protestant brethren; misunderstanding of Catholic doctrine and a failure to distinguish between ob-

jective faith and subjective piety (which, incidentally, was Newman's great difficulty); the bad example of people who are Catholic only in name, sometimes in public office, and too often strengthening the prejudice that the Church is more interested in doctrinal conformity than in ethical principles; ignorance among Catholics of what Protestants believe, how they worship, and what their religion means to them; and a strange modesty about their convictions or reluctance to talk about religion in the company of their Protestant relatives and friends.

Yet when Pope John announced that he planned to summon a unity council of the Church, the response of the Protestant world was spontaneous, genuinely respectful, and in some cases even enthusiastic.

Episcopalian leaders said they looked forward to entering into "consultive dialogue" with Catholic churchmen, and the Archbishop of Canterbury indicated that the Anglican Church would send observers, if invited. Secretary Visser 'T Hooft of the World Council of Churches commented that much would depend "on how ecumenical the council will be in composition and spirit." But he personally hoped that all the churches could unite in a common allegiance to the Saviour.

President Marc Boegner of the Federation of Protestant Churches of France recognized that a new climate of friendship has developed among the great Christian confessions. His American counterpart, President Dahlberg of the National

Council of Churches of Christ felt that "anything that would bring together all the churches of Christ would be blessed of God."

But friendship and good feeling are not enough. There is no doubt that one of the primary aims of the next Vatican Council is to promote a reunion of the Christian world. Pope John has been explicit on the point. After attending to what needs correction or improvement in the Church, he said, "We shall say to the people who are separated from us, Orthodox and Protestant: Come, and take, or resume your place in the Church of Christ, which for many of you is the place of your ancient fathers." Nor is there any question that non-Catholics also want religious unity.

Yet if either the plans of the council or the hopes of the ecumenical movement are ever to be realized, the main source of unitive energy must come from the Catholic laity. Many of them are only mildly concerned over the disunited state of Christendom. Others are concerned but have only a faint idea of what can be done to remedy the situation. However, I think most of them are sincerely interested and know what to do—if only to invite their Protestant friends to Mass or inquiry classes—but they lack the motivation. It is our privilege as educators to offer what they need.

Transmitting other factors, I would stress this motivated knowledge as more value than a passing familiarity with religious cultures that are not Catholic (in America mostly of Prot-

estant ancestry) and among which the students live. Knowledge precedes action as surely as the dawn comes before day. In the degree to which our students know what they have in common with those who are not Catholic, their sense of Christian solidarity will be deepened. In the degree to which they see what these same people lack, but which they possess, their charity will be stimulated and their zeal animated to share.

Educational Opportunity

Addressing myself to Catholic teachers, I believe the projected ecumenical council will be terminally successful to the extent to which we recognize it as a grace of God and cooperate with the same accordingly. If nothing happens by chance with God, certainly the council will not just "occur" or "take place," but will have been divinely ordained for profit to souls and its effectiveness conditioned by the predispositions which it meets.

I suggest, therefore, that we use the council as an occasion for teaching our students certain aspects of the faith that have special bearing on the historic event which is taking place; an event, be it noted, that comes on an average of once in a century, and only twice in the last four hundred years.

History of the Councils. Students should become familiar with the history of the ecumenical councils that have been held by the Church, from Nicea to First Vatican. Taken singly they represent so many crises

which the Church has faced in her existence and has overcome in her conflict with error from within and opposition from outside of her ranks. Taken collectively, they are a synthesis of Catholic teaching on faith and morals and the best evidence we have that Christ founded a living society that grows and matures and adapts herself to human needs without compromising on her divine mission.

As Christians we properly venerate the Scriptures as the word of God and in recent years have come to emphasize their importance in the college curriculum. But as Catholics we know that revelation is not all contained in the Scriptures and, more seriously, that without tradition we should not be sure of their meaning or interpretation. And the most prominent voice of tradition is the councils: like the Council of Trent which defined the canon of the Old and New Testaments, or Ephesus which defended Mary's honor as the Mother of God, or the Second Council of Constantinople which condemned those who denied the eternity of hell, or the Second Council of Nicea which safeguarded the worship of sacred images, or the last Vatican Council which defined the primacy and repudiated the errors of anti-supernaturalism.

Nature and Authority. Corollary to the study of the history of the councils is the investigation of their nature and authority. If we are tempted to regard our modern parliaments or sessions of Congress as something new, we should remember

that for over a thousand years before the idea took root in secular politics, it had been "old stuff" for the Church, since 325 A.D. for all Christendom, and on a provincial basis from the early two-hundreds.

But general councils are not only deliberative parliaments. They are organically united to the papacy, and ultimately derive their authority from convocation and confirmation by the Roman Pontiff. At this point there opens up the whole panorama of conciliarism, which claimed that councils are superior to the Popes; and the whole question of papal authority in relation to the councils, which if properly understood will reveal insights into the character and meaning of Catholicism that I think no other phase of theology can give.

Conciliar Problems. As preparations for the council are advanced, it will become more and more clear what subjects are to be treated and what may or even must be the general lines of approach. By keeping abreast of these developments, teachers can prepare their students (and through them thousands of others) to see the wisdom of whatever conciliar decrees or definitions are finally made.

In the preceding sketch we could only touch on a few of the possible agenda for the council. Other topics and new features of the same problems have already been suggested and more will certainly arise. I understand the Holy Father would like to see a revision of the Code of Canon Law, currently numbering 2,414 pieces of legislation affecting

every aspect of Catholic life and worship. We spoke about Church and State relations, and relations between Catholics and others, as prospective subjects for deliberation. Among these I would emphasize the Church's laws on marriage, divorce and marital morality as the crucial areas of conflict between the Catholic and secular thought of which the council may take cognizance—in order to strengthen the faithful in their fidelity to Christian principles and relieve others of concern that Catholic ideals will be imposed on them by political action or against their free will.

Precept and Obedience. A final word. There is no reason to expect the Second Vatican Council to impose regulations that would meet with serious misgivings on the part of Catholics. Yet Catholics are human and therefore prone to a natural reluctance to obey when their freedom is constrained. Witness the resistance in some quarters, admittedly few and small, that papal infallibility met when defined by the

last Council of the Vatican. By a judicious preparation beforehand, through reasoned exposition of the pros and cons, the conciliar decrees will be guaranteed that generous acceptance among Catholics for which their gift of faith has disposed them.

But more than passive obedience will be a need for zeal to promote and put into apostolic effect the teaching of the future council. Here the teachers in our Catholic schools have an open field. Recall the phrase used by the first assembly at Jerusalem, which met to settle the question of whether Christians should continue to practice Judaic rites. "The Holy Spirit and we have decided . . ." the communication to the churches began. We believe the same Spirit of God protects the Church today and animates her decisions when speaking, as the next council will, to the whole Christian world. As instruments of the Church's magisterium and the means by which her teaching reaches the souls of her children, we know the duties and opportunities that lie ahead.

Reunion is not just around the corner. Nevertheless, the ecumenical movement has in its short history broken down the rancor of centuries.

Can We Unite?*

We are presenting in the following pages a symposium of three differing views on the problems of reunion.

Dr. Berthold von Schenck points out how much Lutherans and Catholics have in common. We think he is somewhat too eager to reconcile the Lutheran "priesthood of all believers" with the Catholic concept of the "priesthood of the laity" which has been brought to the fore recently by the liturgical movement. However, we agree with him that it is significant that today two "liturgical" movements—Catholic and Lutheran—should be developing simultaneously. Moreover, we think it is significant that the Lutheran contributor to our symposium should write primarily about dogma.

Father Alexander Schmemann writes about theology too. He stresses recent developments in both Catholic and Orthodox theology which cause him to view the problems of reunion with some optimism.

Father Gustave Weigel sees no immediate hope for reunion but he writes optimistically of ecumenical work.

We think it is encouraging that Lutherans, Orthodox and Catholics are thinking about reunion. We hope that the day is not far distant when we can give an affirmative answer to the question: Can we unite?

*A symposium of three different views on the ecumenical movement reprinted from the *Catholic World*, 180 Varick St., N.Y. 14, N.Y., February, 1960.

I

A Lutheran Looks at the Ecumenical Movement

REV. BERTHOLD VON SCHENK

IN VIEW of the coming ecumenical council announced by Pope John XXIII, Roman Catholics are centering their attention upon Christians who are not united to the See of Rome. Long before the papal announcement, however, certain Roman Catholic and Lutheran theologians had been meeting in Germany to re-examine their respective doctrinal positions in relation to fundamental Christian tenets. Such meetings still continue.

In the hope of giving American Roman Catholics a clearer statement of the Lutheran position, I have written this article which, while stressing the points of agreement, does not attempt to obscure the real difficulties in the way of reunion.

Bishop Otto Dibelius has named this century the "Century of the Church." What is the Church? Roman Catholics present the Church as "the society of faithful, united by the profession of faith, by the participation in the sacraments and by the submission to the same authority, that of the Pope." The Russian Catechism, composed by the Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow in 1867, states: "The Church is the divinely instituted community of men united by the orthodox faith, the law of

God, the hierarchy and the Sacrament." The Augsburg Confession of the Lutheran Church states in Article 7 that the Church is "the congregation of the Saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments are rightly administered and for the true unity of the Church it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments. It is not necessary that human traditions, rites and ceremonies instituted by men, should everywhere be alike and uniform. As St. Paul says, 'One faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all. . .' (Eph. 4:5-6)"

There is an ecumenical spirit throughout Christendom. Some churchmen have a closed mind to any and all efforts along such lines unless one conforms in every detail to their particular "doxy." Others believe that the ecumenical spirit does not primarily consist in union, but rather in a better understanding and respect for one another. Again, there are also those who oversimplify the problem by desiring *union without unity*. To bring this about they are willing to pay any price, disregarding dogmas, historical considerations, and traditions, admitting any and all to the fold, regardless

of their position in relation to the Holy Trinity, the person and work of the Christ, and the sacraments.

In contrast to the above, there are those enlightened individuals who wish to further a genuinely ecumenical communion and fellowship. These men, dedicated and sincere (although sometimes misunderstood), are primarily interested in discovering the common ground of meeting among the various streams of Christianity and at the same time in re-examining their own respective positions in the light of fresh insights effected through such ecumenical confrontations. Their emphasis is directed to the points of evident agreement rather than to the facets of difference, without, of course, compromising the matter of truth and its pursuit.

The Lutheran Church

The Lutheran Church is a "confessional" communion, that is, it functions in accordance with a prescribed pattern of dogma and doctrine. The dogmas of the historic (catholic) Church are regarded by Lutherans as not merely of some antique importance but rather as valid and binding statements of faith, devotion and worship. Lutheran pastors, at their ordinations, solemnly promise not to teach contrary to the dogmas or confessions of the Church. The confessions are accepted not insofar (*quatenus*) as they are in agreement with revealed Scripture but because (*quia*) they are in agreement with the revealed Word. It is also important to men-

tion that the cardinal confession of the Lutheran Church, the Augsburg Confession, was not written in the heat of passionate controversy, but in a sober and well-considered vein as a report to the Emperor Charles V. The authors of this document acted not as separatists but rather as aware persons seeking a reunion of the Church.

Briefly stated, there can be a better understanding between Lutheran and Roman Catholic Christians. This understanding can develop when each side comes to know the other better, with the realization that there are among us more elements tending to unite than to separate.

At a recent meeting sponsored by a Roman Catholic liturgical society this writer was privileged to deliver a paper entitled "The Life of the Catholic Parish: The Lutheran Experience in the Light of the Doctrine of Justification and the Royal Priesthood." He was pleasantly surprised, at the conclusion of his address, to hear such remarks as "Is this really Lutheran teaching?" . . . "Why, that is Catholic doctrine!"

Perhaps a valid point could be made by quoting from the Lutheran confessions, showing the catholic faith expressed in them:

Concerning the Mass: In Article 10 of the Augsburg Confession we find these words:

Of the Supper of the Lord they teach that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present, and are distributed to those who eat in the Supper of the Lord and they reject those who teach otherwise.

This statement must be considered in the same light as Article 24:

Falsely are our churches accused of abolishing the Mass; for the Mass is retained among us and celebrated with the highest reverence. Nearly all the usual ceremonies are also preserved, save that the parts sung in Latin are interspersed here and there with German hymns, which have been added to teach the people. For ceremonies are needed to this end alone, that the unlearned be taught. . . . It does not appear that the Mass is more devoutly celebrated among our adversaries than among ourselves.

It is also interesting to note that Luther, in contradistinction to St. Thomas Aquinas, celebrated Mass daily.

Concerning Sacrifice: The Apology to the Augsburg Confession here states that:

The proximate species of sacrifice are two, and there are no more. One is the propitiatory sacrifice, i.e., a work which makes satisfaction for guilt and punishment, i.e., one that reconciles God, or appeases God's wrath or which merits the remission of sins for others. The other species is the eucharistic sacrifice, which does not merit the remission of sins or reconciliation but is rendered by those who have been reconciled in order that we may give thanks or return gratitude for the remission of sins that has been received.

Concerning Confession:

Confession (private) in the churches is not abolished among us, for it is not usual to give the Body of the Lord except to them that have been previously examined and absolved. Our people are taught that they should

highly prize the absolution, as being the voice of God, and pronounced in God's command.

Protestants cannot understand the consistent position of Lutherans in not joining their pseudo-ecumenical endeavors. Benjamin Lotz, writing in *The Christian Century* (October 6, 1943) designates them as the "recalcitrant Lutherans." He writes further in the same article:

The year 1529 is a good time to begin. The place is Marburg, on the River Lahn. The *dramatis personae* are Luther, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Bucer, Melanchthon, Jonas, Osiander. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper is the great stumbling block. . . . "You have a different spirit," the ex-monk declares. He cannot play the hypocrite. . . . The flowers in his hand will wilt, but not the word he writes: *Hoc est corpus meum*.

Here we see Luther defending the catholic faith. But this was not all, for there was more at stake than mere interpretation of the words, "This is my Body." What was actually in question at Marburg was the humanity of the Christ, the conviction that the risen and ascended Lord is true God and true Man. To the compromising Oecolampadius, who said that Luther should not think so much of the humanity of the Christ, Luther replied that he knew and honored no other God than the one who became man.

This God is present in the Sacrament just as substantially as He was born of the Blessed Virgin. Apart from the God-Man there is no salvation. Consequently, the humanity of

the Lord must not be underestimated or neglected. Luther clearly indicated the relation between the Incarnation and the Real Presence in the Mass. He insisted that the Incarnate One is always with the Church, both in His divinity and in His humanity. He stated, "Whenever you can say 'Here is God,' you must also say Christ, the Man, is here too."

Luther's Struggle

Luther entered, even before the Reformation, the great struggle of the Church against "spiritualism," a movement which threatened to undermine the doctrine of the Incarnation and the statement of the Real Presence. The separation of the two natures of Christ, according to Luther, would not mean only the total abandonment of the two natures but also the rejection of the Virgin Birth. In this struggle for the catholic faith the Lutheran theologians reaffirmed the old rule that the quest for the Gospel was the quest for the Sacrament, and conversely that the quest for the Sacrament was the quest for the Gospel.

It has been said that the formulation of dogmas reveals a weakness in the Church, for doctrines are usually not defined until they are questioned. The early Church felt no need of defining beliefs. The sacraments are to be done, not to be speculated upon. There may be some truth to such a view, for it was indeed the waning of sacramental piety which compelled the Church to formulate dogmas.

The first teaching of the eucharistic sacrament was formulated in the Middle Ages. However, this is not to convey the wholly erroneous impression that the Church possessed no definite beliefs in prior times. It was merely that these things were accepted without question for many centuries, no theologian of the ancient Church ever seriously doubted that according to the words of institution the consecrated bread was the true Body of the Christ and that the wine was His Blood. The Eastern Church to this day possesses no explicit dogma on the Eucharist since the liturgy is binding on all concerning its dogmatic content.

In the course of history, Christians maintained their private interpretations of the respective Christian phenomena. Two of Christendom's saints, Ambrose and Augustine of Hippo, stand behind the disputants of the ninth century. Ambrose was cited as the great authority for sacramental realism which prevailed increasingly in the following centuries; Augustine was the father of a spiritualistic understanding of the Sacrament. The early liturgies, the Ambrosian and the Gallican, do not indicate a genuine transformation, let alone a "transubstantiation," of the eucharistic elements. The Canon of the Mass also does not proceed in such fashion; in it God is asked to accept the offering: "Which oblation do Thou, O God, vouchsafe in all things to bless, approve, ratify, make worthy and acceptable that it become for us the true Body and Blood

of Thy most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ." The original meaning of this text, which goes back to the fourth century, conveys the thought that not the words of institution but rather the acceptance of the offering make the elements the Body and Blood of the Christ. It is difficult to read a metabole into this old text.

It was, however, the Berengarian controversy (Berengarius of Tours was, as far as we know, the first to interpret the words of institution topically, the "*est*" as meaning "*significat*") which brought about a settlement of the disputes concerning the Real Presence; these disagreements arose as something of a "heritage" of the respective works and thoughts of Ambrose and Augustine. Prior to these clashes of learned opinion the Western Church (as also the Eastern Catholics) was apparently completely satisfied with the simple belief that the Sacrament was an inscrutable mystery. Nor were such words of the medieval theologians as *conversio*, *mutatio*, etc., of any great concern, for they were merely an attempt to express an incomprehensible mystery in ordinary language. Whether the formulation of a transubstantiation dogma was wise or unwise is not called into question here. But one may question its pragmatic effects in helping to alleviate the extreme difficulties of the situation. However, under the conditions then prevailing, it was necessary to formulate a clearly stated dogma in defense of the issue at hand: the Real Presence.

It is quite possible that Luther-

ans, believing firmly in the Real Presence, are just as content and secure without a dogma of transubstantiation. It is also quite possible that both Lutherans and Roman Catholics believe in the same Real Presence. It may be of interest to know that the much-quoted lines of Aquinas: "*Lauda, Sion,*" were frequently employed by Martin Luther and some later Lutheran theologians. This sequence, written by St. Thomas as for the feast of *Corpus Christi*, is echoed in the German hymns "*Schmücke Dich, O liebe Seele*" (Soul, Adorn Thysel with Gladness) and "*O Lord, We Praise Thee*," written by Martin Luther. A stanza of the latter runs thus:

*May Thy Body,
Lord, born of Mary,
That our sins and sorrows did carry,
And Thy Blood for us plead
In all trial, fear and need.
Kyrie Eleison!*

The above is quoted, not in a spirit of controversy, but rather as an attempt to show that in spite of the disagreement in the formulation of a dogma, there is a great essential agreement. Nor is Aquinas to be condemned. He was indeed under as much uncomfortable pressure as Luther when he attempted to rationalize the mystery of the Mass (the "in, with, and under" of the Lutheran Catechism). To him the Mass was not "magic," compelling the deity to act in a certain, prescribed fashion. St. Thomas held that the words of institution are effective because they are the words of the Christ, and the celebrant is

only an instrument of the Christ. Christ is the true consecrator.

There is, however, one marked difficulty and difference. It came about when the Roman Church did not abide by its earlier conviction in making the priest a "partner" with the Christ in the most solemn act of the Mass. Unfortunately, such initially insignificant variances of practice can grow to later gulfs of separation.

In the Protestant denominations, ecumenical thinking permits incredible latitude with respect to doctrinal matters. Many times it is quite evident that doctrinal aspects of intercommunion need not be taken in a literal manner, but only that "unity must be taken literally." This, of course, is "rose-water" theology; neither Lutherans nor Roman Catholics would ever be guilty of such grossly conceived "unity," for both possess a definite image of the sacramental life and both have a quest for the Gospel through a quest for the Sacrament.

This loose Protestant thinking is certainly far astray from the theology of Athanasius, Luther, and Calvin, all of whom insisted that truth is more important than outward peace and unity. It was of paramount importance to these individuals that Christians be exposed to the turbulent and demanding claims of truth as manifested in the imperatives of Jesus Christ. To be grounded and established in truth was to them not only the burden of theologians but of all believers because they shared the priesthood.

But Lutherans and Roman Catholics subscribe to the Catholic creeds and to the four ecumenical councils. They believe that the Church is the Communion of Saints; the signs of the Church are the proclamation of the Gospel message and the celebration of the sacraments according to Christ's commands.

Whether the Church officially acknowledges this basic unity is not of prime importance, for the unity is there implicitly. Union is established whenever the Mass is celebrated, for there is: "One faith, one baptism, one God and Father. . . ."

The Cleavage

It would be difficult to state whether or not the cleavage between Lutherans and Roman Catholics is lessening. There is, however, an advent of better understanding at present between Lutherans and Roman Catholic theologians, in addition to a growing mutual respect. This is especially evident in Germany. A report, comprising some twelve theses, was published in 1957, which caused much interest in both communions. The Rome newspaper *Il Quotidiano*, of July 11, 1957, carried an extensive article on these theses, entitled "Evangelical Statements of Catholic Truth." A German daily, *Rheinischer Merkur*, of August 2, 1957, said: "Behind the twelve theses is an inaudible pressure of spiritual passion for the unity of the Church, and behind this passion there are hounded and troubled Christians, irrespective of their confessions." The Roman Cath-

olic *Allgemeine Sonntagszeitung*, of July 7, 1959, maintains: ". . . and thus the nailing of these theses hits us Catholics in the heart."

The theses discuss a number of very controversial points: the mysteries of the Christian Church; the relationship of grace and freedom; the sacrifice of the Christ and the sacrifice of the Church; the episcopal and apostolic succession; the office of the priest; ordination; the primacy of the Petrine office; the episcopal teaching office; the relationship of Holy Scripture to ecclesiastical tradition; and the significance of saint-veneration in the life of the Church.

This report has appeared in Germany under the title of *Catholic Reformation*. A few quotations will suggest further study of the material contained within the twelve theses:

Karl Barth preached a sermon on Good Friday in a prison at Basle. He stated that the two evil-doers on the right and left of Jesus were the first Christian congregation . . . for "a Christian congregation is there where there is a meeting of people who are near to Jesus and are with him."

It is true that only one malefactor recognized Jesus; the other rejected him. But

this difference was not so great that it could negate the promise. Therefore the word of the apostle can be applied to both malefactors: "Since we died with Jesus, we know that we will also live with Him."

And:
We beseech you to ask with us the

question: Is it not a cheap self-righteousness if we consider the rift of the Body of Christ as inevitable? How can prayer come out of such resignation, how can one get into action through such resignation? Is not this simply disobedience and unbelief?

Again:

Our unbelief shows itself in this, that we are fully satisfied to call ourselves the church of the reformation, but we do not even agree with the Church of the Lutheran Reformation. Can you defend the fact that the good endeavors to return to a complete service of the Lutheran Mass and to restore the holy sacraments to their proper position meets with such opposition?

We act as if our Church had its beginning in 1517. Are we really willing to give up all the vast treasures of the pre-Reformation Church? Have we not every reason to reconsider the apostolic truths of the episcopacy and the great gifts God gave to humanity through monasticism. . . ? Have we the right to be silent about the truth that grace penetrates creation and meets us in the created realities of the reward of good works. . . ? It is due to unbelief that we see the Church as only temporal and do not realize the mysteries and therefore no longer live with the saints.

We do not presume that the two great Confessions in Germany are ripe for reunion. We do know that the truth is still among us. In this respect our relationship to the Roman Catholic Church is not an exceptional case. Or do we criticize the Roman Catholic Church that she, like many an evangelical church, is afraid to declare articles of faith as binding truths for this age? We beseech our Roman Catholic brethren to tell us why the possession of faith, which separates us,

should give us a lesser share in the truths of Christ (less than they), for upon this it alone depends.

These reports were sent to 20,000 evangelical pastors and laymen. The noteworthy aspects of these theses is that they have not raised a greater stir in Germany, as one would naturally anticipate, but that there are men who are speaking courageously on this touchy subject. This is not without great significance.

When Lutherans read the *Catholic Reformation*, the writings of Guardini, Odo Cassel, Karl Adam, Friederick Heiler, Hans Asmussen, *et al.*, they are led to think: Are we not disunited in less important teachings and practices, smaller things which were brought about by the piety of the laity, than in the great questions of the apostolic faith?

Catholic Lutherans, however, who are praying and working for a better understanding and Christian unity with Rome, have been quite disturbed by the growing Catholic Marian devotion which they consider excessive. In addition, the dogma of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin has been very divisive for eventual unity and union. The Lutherans did not cast out the saints. Article 21 of the *Confessio Augustana* states:

Of the worship of saints they teach that the memory of saints may be set before us, that we may follow their faith and good works, according to our calling. . . . But the Scripture teaches not the invocation of saints, since it sets

before us the one Christ as Mediator, Propitiator, High Priest, Intercessor. He is to be prayed to.

The propers for the saints' days are printed in the *Lutheran Service Book*, and the Marian feasts are also observed and celebrated. At a social gathering of three learned Roman Catholic theologians and a Lutheran scholar, the question was asked, "Are there any outstanding books on the Blessed Virgin?" The answer was given by a Roman theologian, "Only two. They were written by Lutherans: Luther's treatise on the *Magnificat*, and the book *Mary, the Mother of God*, by Hans Asmussen." Lutherans recognize the need for Marian devotion, but they see Mary and reverence her particularly because she was the "handmaiden of God": "Be it done unto me according to Thy word." They fear that the very need which brought about Marian devotion is negated by elevating the handmaid of the Lord to the status of Queen of Heaven and endowing her with honors, cultus, and devotion due only the deity.

The Priesthood

The sacerdotalism of the Roman Church is another disturbing factor in the eyes of those who seek closer relationships with the Roman Church and the fellowship of the Christ. Since this problem is also recognized in Roman circles, one may speak frankly, without fear of offending. An outstanding book such as Yves Congar's *Lay People in the Church*

and the efforts recently made for a "lay apostolate" are encouraging steps in the right direction.

However, one wonders if the problem does not go deeper than these efforts. Is it not a liturgical question and a problem of the confrontation of the Body of the Christ, the Church? The Church is, by common definition, the assembling of the saints, the holy ones, of God. This is the Body of Jesus as the Christ. All are members of this group, this Body, all are priests, functioning in His Body. There can be no higher office than that of the royal priest. The Old Testament priesthood, since the ripping of the Temple curtain which separated the *Sanctum Sanctorum* from the Holy Place, found its fulfillment, not in a special ministry, not in the presbyters, nor in the Apostles, but in the saints who gather about the Holy.

Unfortunately the Reformation, although an improvement in the theology of the laymen, did not bring about a realistic improvement, for the Lutherans merely substituted the theologian and preacher for the priest; the laity still remained either a mere spectator or auditor at the Mass and his liturgy was not restored to him. Hence, there has been a genuinely tragic loss of a functioning priest at the offering of the Sacrament. The offering was the

acme of the ancient liturgies in the embryonic Church. When the layman receives his complete role in the liturgy, when he again participates in full dignity as a priest, he will know why he must be present at the celebration of the Eucharist. Absence from the Mass is a blatant denial of the baptismal vow and the priesthood. The layman must know that he offers himself as an identification of himself with the Sacrifice of Calvary, shown forth at the Communion of Saints.

A bright spot in the otherwise gloomy sky of our disunion is the liturgical revival now in progress throughout a large segment of Christendom. The common need in both churches has brought about this resurgence; this common need has often brought like-minded men together in meetings where they may dispassionately exercise self-criticism on the deterioration of worship and thus discover a like meeting ground for a proper evaluation of the Church's rich cultic heritage.

If one should dare venture a suggestion—both groups, Lutheran and Roman, should become again what they are in actuality, according to their better traditions, and realize that sectarianism, even by churches having the catholic faith, is a violation and an insult to the Holy Catholic Church.

II

An Orthodox Theologian Views Reunion

VERY REV. ALEXANDER SCHMEMANN

THE FOLLOWING remarks are not to be taken as reflecting in any way the official reaction of the Orthodox Church or even Orthodox theology to the announcement of the ecumenical council made by the Pope. It must be emphasized that at present no official statement has been issued which would be binding on all Orthodox churches as expressing their common attitude. All that has been said—sometimes by very high prelates or important theologians—represents only private opinions. It is only by means of a pan-Orthodox council at which the heads of all the Orthodox churches would be officially represented that an authoritative response can be given to the Pope's announcement. Up until now no move in that direction has been made by the Patriarch of Constantinople (to whom traditionally belongs the primacy of honor in the Orthodox Church) or any other Orthodox leader. The private opinions already expressed are however very important for they prepare the "consensus," the agreement necessary for a really adequate statement of the mind of the Orthodox Church; they stimulate a "catholic" effort which at this stage seems more important than anything else.

Unable for obvious reasons to deal with all issues which the papal announcement necessarily raises, I will limit myself to a few reflections whose only aim is to indicate, if possible, the *right perspective*, the *proper context* for any further discussion or even action. I am absolutely convinced that without a certain preliminary agreement on the *agenda* of what has to be done and also on the methods to be used, all conversations about reunion will remain pointless.

"Non-Theological" Factors

My first observation concerns those aspects of the whole problem which in ecumenical language have been called "non-theological." Although Orthodox theologians have always and rightly put doctrine in the center of all preoccupations with Christian unity and have insisted on doctrinal agreement as the "*conditio sine qua non*" of all ecumenical progress, it seems to me that in dealing with the relations between Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism, the "non-theological" factors have a particular significance. The term refers to the political, national and even racial involvements and also the personal conflicts that con-

tributed to and accompanied the break. We must not forget that the relations between the East and the West, besides having been a theological conflict, a very real and deep disagreement in faith, were a tremendous historical and human tragedy. We must also remember that a sympathetic understanding of this tragedy is absolutely essential if we want the climate of our relations to be changed and purified.

We must openly admit that the historical approach to this tragedy has so far been much too "self-righteous" on both sides, no one admitting the possibility of having been wrong even on a purely human level. To give but one example: the painful history of the so-called "unionistic" attempts between 1054 (date of the final break of communion between Rome and Constantinople) and the Council of Florence in 1439 forms a sequence of events that needs a complete re-evaluation and a new understanding. It is clear to any unbiased student of Byzantine history that "unions" signed by the Greeks in Lyons (1274) and in Florence (1439) were "forced" upon them not by a sincere agreement in faith and doctrine, but by a political situation—the menace of the Turks to the Empire—and that they were, therefore, more political than religious or ecclesiastical.

How many Roman Catholics know that the great majority of the Greek hierarchs who attended and signed the "union" of Florence, rejected it immediately upon their return to Constantinople? How many under-

stand the real spiritual climate in the East at the time of all these developments?

There is need today to distinguish clearly between the "essence" and the "accidents" of the East-West division. For it is precisely the "non-theological" background and motivation of many of those events that have transformed a doctrinal and canonical dispute between Rome and the East into a deeply rooted mutual suspicion and even hatred which in turn have become integrated into national psychologies and popular traditions. Centuries of violence (and there was violence on both sides!) and politico-ecclesiastical diplomacy are not easily forgotten.

Besides these non-theological factors, there is of course the *doctrinal content* of our division and needless to say it constitutes the very crux of the whole problem. Here also the question of method and approach must be solved first. There is on the one hand the old classical procedure: having established the precise list of our doctrinal disagreements, to discuss them one by one. The list is well known: papal infallibility, the *Filioque*, Immaculate Conception, purgatory. . . . But this method of isolation (i.e., of considering each problem in itself and from the standpoint of its formulation in official texts), although used in confessional polemics since the earliest stage of the tragic division, can hardly be accepted as adequate today. For it has become clear now, after several years of a more irenic (i.e., objective, charitable and sci-

tific) study of the schism, that the roots of the whole doctrinal issue between the Latin West and the Orthodox East lie in a break in theological understanding, in a progressive alienation of the two theological languages and thought forms from each other.

The Orthodox East and the Roman West ceased to understand each other "theologically" long before the actual schism was consummated. And here also a mere reading of the innumerable polemical treatises written since the eleventh century makes us seriously doubt whether all this can be called a dialogue —if by dialogue we mean a discussion within the same frame of concepts and references. The only feasible method consists therefore in penetrating beyond the precise points of disagreement in an attempt to recover, first of all, a common theological perspective, a consistent "catholic" language.

A genuine dialogue can begin only if and when a conceptual agreement is reached and the terms of reference defined. But this requires a tremendous effort of theological thinking. Here another example can be cited. If, beyond any doubt, a discussion of the primacy is in order, is it not necessary to begin with an historical and theological investigation of the various meanings, the different connotations and implications that this term "primacy" had in the West and in the East? Otherwise the discussion is pointless. It is very likely that the concept of primacy was used in two different

meanings, and it is only when we are sure that both meanings are clear to everyone that the question of their compatibility can be raised.

Dialogue Possible?

At this point the last question must be presented: is such a dialogue, is such a common "recapitulation" possible? Have not the two doctrinal systems with their corresponding theological languages reached a state of development and "perfection" that makes unthinkable any reconsideration or re-evaluation? I venture to suggest that theological developments of the last decade, without entitling us to cheap optimism, allow for some degree of hope. There is, first of all, the great movement of going back to the very sources of faith and doctrine, a movement that has deeply affected the very climate of theological work in both the East and the West. It consists in a new and a very vital common interest in the Fathers, in the whole patristic understanding of the faith of the Church, in the rediscovery of the liturgy, in the *lex orandi* (law of prayer) as the *lex credendi* (law of faith), and last but not least in an almost total renovation of Biblical studies. In all these endeavors the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox theologians not only followed parallel paths, but much of the work has been done in common with mutual influence and inspiration. There is also, as the result of these new orientations, a revival of interest in the nature of the Church, in the experience of living in the

Church and sharing its mystical and sacramental life. This puts the Church in the very center of the theological preoccupations of our time.

If it is difficult to foresee the impact of this new theological situation on the movement toward reunion, at least this much is clear: there exists today a possibility of dialogue which did not exist before. The Roman Catholic theology on the one hand seems to be recovering those dimensions which were virtually forgotten during the triumph of Latinism in its pure form, and is becoming more "open" to some of the basic affirmations of the East. The Orthodox East on the other hand is slowly overcoming its age-long national fragmentation, and is acquiring a new sense of "catholicity." Thus, for example, in the Roman Catholic ecclesiology today we see attempts to correct the one-sided, almost exclusively institutional and juridical idea of the Church with a more organic, sacramental and mystical understanding of its life. Under similar influences the Orthodox theologians are becoming more receptive to some structural and institutional aspects of the Church which were often overlooked and neglected by their predecessors.

I do not want to be misinterpreted. I do not mean that all the differences in dogma between Rome and us are nothing but a theological misunderstanding and can be easily dissipated once a "common

language" and a new psychological climate are accepted on both sides as we learn to understand each other. There remains ultimately the reality of Truth itself and this reality inescapably leads us to a final choice between what is *right* and what is *wrong*. But what I am trying to say is that before we reach the stage wherein such a choice becomes necessary and unavoidable, everything that obscures or has obscured the real scope of this ultimate choice must be removed. And it is here at this preliminary stage that the dialogue of which I speak is of absolute necessity if we want to go beyond the old polemics. In fact this dialogue has begun. Since the papal announcement was made, numerous articles have appeared, written by Roman as well as Orthodox theologians. Although their approach, the emphasis they put on this or that aspect of the problem, may differ, one can discern in all of them a truly new spirit.

Discussions of the problem of reunion have gone far beyond the specialized circles of "unionists" and, in fact, the whole Christian world seems to be in expectation and hope. All this requires a new spiritual climate, not one of easy-going compromise but of total sincerity and honesty, of a common readiness to listen to the Holy Spirit. And then maybe what seems impossible for men will be revealed as possible in God.

III

In Our Love Is Our Hope

GUSTAVE WEIGEL, S.J.

WE SPEAK of the ecumenical movement but the phenomenon has become more than that. It is something more stable than a mere movement. It has become institutionalized. On the non-Catholic side we have the magnificent structure of the World Council of Churches with a constitution and a functioning machinery of action. On the Catholic side there are different associations as yet uncoordinated among themselves: the *Una Sancta* group of Germany, the International Conference on Ecumenical Questions, the *Unitas* society. They are not large but they have stable frameworks. Catholics look with hope to the coming ecumenical council announced by Pope John XXIII, which should be ecumenical in the old and new sense of the word.

Elsewhere I have distinguished between the hope and the scope of these organizations. By far the most important and most influential of them all is the World Council of Churches. In comparison with it the Catholic associations are little satellite bodies. In the matter of hope and scope the World Council knows where it stands. It certainly is dynamized by the hope of a single *una sancta ecclesia* in God's good

time. Hence members of the World Council are not impatient, though very serious in marching toward the hoped-for end. Their scope is to bring the churches together and in their fully lived meetings of sharing, the Holy Spirit can move the churches to ever greater unity.

The Catholic groups, each in its own way, are trying to do the same thing. Some concentrate on being together as the immediate aim of their action; others primarily keep in mind the end goal of fellowship: all in the one Catholic Church. The different aims dictate different methods of action.

Granted that we now have a crystallization of the purposes which all ecumenists pursue, we must yet look at the situation which actually confronts us. It is not hard to point to many events and achievements which prove that the ecumenical endeavor is effective. If we restrict our attention to such phenomena we could easily fall into the trap of believing that the one visible Church for all who profess the Christian name is just around the corner. I submit that this is not so, nor do I think that anyone seriously engaged in ecumenical effort believes that it is so.

The Facts

We must consider the facts. The World Council has already achieved some degree of unity for the churches which are members of the organization. Of course they are striving for more. Within the council there is a special problem arising from the views of the Orthodox churches. Outside its own fellowship, the big problem the council faces is undoubtedly the Church of Rome. There are some few Protestants who think that they can prescind totally from the Catholic Church, but this belief is not shared by the majority. The ultimate one Church cannot become a reality if we have a Catholic Church next to a non-Catholic Church. One Church means one Church, and although two would be better than 250, such a situation would still be less than what is hoped for. The World Council makes it quite clear that it does not want to be a Pan-Protestantism, Inc.

How can the actual pluralism of the churches become a single unity? That is the practical question which confronts all ecumenists. It seems to me that in the light of the ecumenical movement three solutions are possible *a priori*. Obviously there must be one Faith and one Lord, one Body and one Spirit keeping the many members of the Body together. On this all are agreed. Yet there are at present so many different views and different associations based on these views that the consequence is a plurality of dif-

ferent unities rather than only one. How can we overcome the differences?

One simple solution which would occur to any man who knows how secular groups combine into a single entity, is to approach the problem after the fashion of diplomats. The essence of their action is to introduce effective compromises wherein the parties in separation give up some of their peculiar positions distasteful to the other side, and take on certain elements much loved by the other. In this process of give and take, a final basis is achieved which is thoroughly acceptable to all. The compromise produces a new thing which is not entirely the things which previously existed nor yet entirely different. But the big point is that all are now united in understanding and its consequent patterns of action. Through compromise it is possible to reach an undoubted unity with a high degree of flexibility for minimal and maximal expression.

If this method of uniting the churches were used, we would see something like the following. The Eastern Orthodox believe in infant baptism and demand for any baptism a triple immersion. Nor can or should Orthodox baptism be repeated. Some Baptists believe in baptism as an external sign of inner faith and it is thus obviously for maturer minds. It is to be done by immersion. If at any baptism real faith was lacking, then with the coming of true faith, the baptism is repeated. The Quakers do not believe in water baptism at all; they

believe in the baptism of the Spirit.

By compromise all three could accept a light sprinkling baptism for adolescents, leaving open the question of the possibility of re-baptism or the ultimate meaning of the action. All would practice one kind of baptism leaving the believers free to theologize about the matter, each in his own way.

Compromise Rejected

Although compromise is conceivably a way to make the churches one, no one in the ecumenical movement desires it. All are most forthright in rejecting compromise as a valid road to union. The reason is obvious and obviously valid. One cannot compromise with the will of God. The different views on baptism are held by their adherents because they believe that their baptismal doctrine and practice are the will of God. They cannot come to terms for anything less or anything different. This is not intransigence on the part of the different believers. They do not think that baptism in meaning and practice is a man-made institution but God's revealed will. By the very nature of religious commitment to God, they cannot permit human tamperings.

If compromise, though conceivably possible as a road to union, is as a matter of fact and principle rejected by ecumenists, what is left? There are two other ways. The first is the way of comprehension.

By comprehension I mean the acceptance of certain principles of faith, polity and worship, but allow-

ing variety in the understanding of the accepted principles. There would be unity without compromise, but a unity which imposes no uniformity of formulation or expression. Evangelical and liturgical services are both valid forms of Christian worship, and particular churches could choose one or the other. In both types of common prayer the Christian people could unite with Christ grasped in faith to praise and give thanks to the Father. In polity, the administration of Church affairs, a church needs ministers. If the episcopal form of church authority were preferred by a particular church, there could be no objection because Christian tradition has long known and approved this mode of structure. If a non-episcopal form of polity were preferred, the Christian principle of the universal priesthood of believers would permit non-episcopal forms. In both forms the principle of priesthood would be honored and accepted though the expression of the principle would not be uniform.

Similarly, older creeds do not exhaust the possibilities of newer expressions of faith and therefore newer symbolic confessions would not be excluded, nor would different theologies approaching the saving event in Jesus as Christ, deny the event. They would only express it differently in the light of new theological insights. The Nicene Creed is not the only way of stating the divinity and lordship of Jesus Christ. Hence churches could restrict themselves to the Nicene formula, or if

they wish, use a different formula for the same Christian Faith to which the 318 holy fathers gave witness in their way at Nicea.

The way of comprehension is very appealing to the Anglo-Saxon mind. The Church of England has already achieved it within its communion which comprehends Anglo-Catholics, higher or lower churchmen, and Evangelicals. Catholics of course have a different viewpoint but it must be stressed that comprehension is not compromise nor is it merely doctrinal indifference. It is a principle of union, for all Anglicans are one in the one Church of England. Anglo-Catholics can receive communion in an Evangelical parish of the Church and vice versa. The nuclear theory in this position is that basic Christian principles must be held by all but it is recognized that these principles have varying expressions in word and act.

Now comprehension is not entirely excluded from the Catholic or Orthodox approach to union of the Churches. Both Catholic and Orthodox readily admit varieties in the liturgy as to its languages and ritual. They also look favorably at different customs and canon laws for different parts of the Church. But the principle of comprehension in Catholicism and Orthodoxy is much more restricted than among the Anglicans. The Catholics and the Orthodox insist on the uniform understanding of the ancient creeds of the Church. Nicea, Ephesus, Chalcedon and Second Nicea are forever definitive in their teaching. They cannot

be ignored nor another creed set up different from the ancient symbols. In the matter of polity they insist that the Church of Christ is episcopal and the bishops must be within the apostolic succession. They cannot comprehend non-episcopal churches into their communions. In general, Catholics and Orthodox reject comprehension as the way to union though they can practice some comprehension in liturgy and customs for those who have already entered formal union with them.

The Way of Conversion

There is a last way to the union of the churches and it is the way of conversion. This means that all the churches except one will leave their churches and enter into the one remaining church. Clearly this produces a single church, for all others would disappear. This is the radical demand both of the Orthodox within the World Council of Churches and of the Catholics outside of it.

Though this may be the method demanded by Catholics and Orthodox, other Christians certainly do not favor it. Many voices within the World Council have rejected the standing invitation of the popes to "come back." They do not see in such a step the fulfillment of their ecumenical hopes and they believe that this is too high a price to pay for union. All of them believe that they are in the Church of Christ and there is no question of coming back, which is equivalent to saying that they are not there now.

It would be rash to say that these

three ways toward the union of the churches are the only ones. Yet it does not seem rash to say that they are the only three ways at present apparent. Hence in the situation of the moment we can say that no substantial formal union of all the churches is possible because no one way of achieving unity is acceptable to all the churches.

More than half of all the Christians of the world are Roman Catholics. By this fact alone the position of Catholicism must be a central concern for all ecumenists. Even if all the others—conservative Protestants, liberal Protestants, middle-of-the-road Protestants, Eastern Orthodox—Slav and Greek, Oriental non-Orthodox churches—could form a formal union resulting in one church (an event which even the most sanguine ecumenist does not see possible in our time), the patent fact would be that this church would not even comprise half the Christians in the world. Ecumenism to be serious must be preoccupied with union with the Catholic Church.

But the Catholic Church is adamant that the way is through conversion. This way is thoroughly distasteful for all the others, nay, for many of them it is blasphemous. One may relegate the question of final union to a future time and stress friendly coming together now. This of course would not answer the ultimate question but only shelve it in the hope that the Catholic Church will change her stand. If she were to change substantially, by that change alone the question would be

solved, because she would have been converted to one of the other churches. But even in this hypothesis, which no Catholic by his faith can conceive is possible, the way to union is through conversion.

Where We Stand

Where then do we stand? In a disunity which for any foreseeable time will continue. I do not think that Professor Oscar Cullmann is wrong when he says that Protestantism and Catholicism can never become one church unless one of the two is converted to the other. Yet this does not mean for him a separation of the churches. He sees that they will be divided in creed, polity and worship, but they can still be one in love. By the active charity of one group for the other, they will remain distinct but not separated. This idea has elements which merit serious investigation even though it is not the ecumenical hope.

Catholics and Orthodox have a better chance of uniting, though it would be naive to say that the chances are rosy. In most questions of theological substance these two churches are in agreement. Where there is disagreement harmonization is possible on many points. The Orthodox are willing today to admit the primacy of the Bishop of Rome but according to the undeveloped lines of another era. The Vatican decrees are not acceptable to the Orthodox at the moment and strong historical resentments militate against any serene discussion of the matter. In the case of the union of these

two churches conversion would not be so evident, because the final agreement would be in the fashion of a settlement of an old family quarrel. But it would be conversion on ultimate analysis.

The tenor of this article might be diagnosed as pessimistic. However, it is not. It strives to be realistic and its conclusion certainly is not that ecumenical effort is illusory and unprofitable. In the light of the facts ecumenical effort is more imperative than ever. But the kind of ecumenism called for must be dynamized by the roots of Christian faith rather than by the hope of future results. Oscar Cullmann has seen this very well. The great Christian law is the law of love for all men and when it is observed it draws men together.

Perfect love produces perfect union, but imperfect love is still unifying even though the union is less than perfect. Human beings must learn to live with their imperfection because it is an inescapable condition. Protestants, Catholics and Orthodox all accept the law of love. For all it is logical by their own

theologies that charity embrace God and the neighbor. When they look on the other Christian with this love, the situation has changed. This we see clearly. In its relatively short history the ecumenical movement has broken down the rancors of centuries. The different churches do get along better today than they did fifty years ago. We recognize one another; we see good will in each other; we hold converse with each other. We still feel some irritation but we are manfully and, to a degree, successfully overcoming it.

More of this must go on. This we can do and the results will be excellent and consoling. It is not for us to demand that God do this or that. By trying to live more in accord with His will, we are serving Him and doing His will. That will, mysterious to us, is the norm of our behavior and we accept it humbly as it manifests itself. We certainly cannot dictate to God. We know He wants the union of the churches but that is His business and He will attend to it wisely, kindly, in His way and in His time.

Our problem is that we no longer know who or what we are. We have lost our grasp on the meaning and purpose of life. We no longer see ourselves as a people bound together by common affirmations, common assumptions, common loyalties to a commonly shared universe of values.

Have We Gone Soft?

THURSTON N. DAVIS, S.J.
Editor, AMERICA

LIKE a strong and vigorous person suddenly stricken in middle life, we appear obsessed with a fatal diagnosis which tells us we are sick and will surely die unless we somehow change the habitual pattern of our lives. And, as diseased people often do, we talk at great length about the latest chance remark dropped by the doctor. The malady is variously described. Columbia President Grayson Kirk's verdict is "spiritual flabbiness." Alan Drury, in *Advise and Consent*, writes of our time as the Age of the Shrug, and stresses the "dry

rot" every perceptive American senses in the air around him. Professor Charles A. Siepmann, who heads the New York City branch of the American Civil Liberties Union, declared only the other day: "We're breeding a new type of human being—a guy with a full belly, an empty mind and a hollow heart. I see them walking about, and I don't like them one bit."

All this gives added point to John Steinbeck's letter to Governor Stevenson. To "dear Adlai," Steinbeck transmits his two first impressions of the USA of 1959-60: first, "a creep-

*Reprinted from the *New Republic*, 1244 19th St., N.W., Washington, D.C., February 15, 1960.

ing, all-pervading nerve gas of immorality"; second, "a nervous restlessness; a hunger, a thirst, a yearning for something unknown—perhaps morality." Then, as afterthoughts, two further impressions: "the violence, cruelty and hypocrisy symptomatic of a people which has too much," and "the surly ill temper" that afflicts "humans when they are frightened." "Mainly, Adlai, I am troubled by the cynical immorality of my country. I don't think it can survive on this basis."

Where do we go to gather evidence on our alleged decadence, immorality and materialism? We might pick up the travel supplement in our Sunday *New York Times*, and glance at the mid-winter ads for hotels and motels along the neon-bright strip of Miami Beach. There, in one concentrated spree of vulgarity, we move from star-studded offers of *Fun, Fun, Fun, at Low, Low Rates*—with "authentic Polynesian Luau's" thrown in free at one address—all the way to siren assurances that if we reserve *Now* (at \$16 daily per person) then *Paradise (double occupancy) Is So Near At Hand!*

Our Moral Miasma

This sort of thing, I suppose, is materialism, though it is somewhat too obvious to be named decadence. But it isn't merely the Miamis of the world that are at issue. If Steinbeck, and all the other critics are to be credited, this moral miasma which afflicts us is well-nigh universal. It is the fly-now-pay-later

urge. It's the itch for the fast buck, for the irresponsible pleasure, for the short cut to power or payola or prideful status. It's the clever dodge, the inside track, the deal, the gimmick, the angle, the guy we know who'll "fix" it. It is the "filter" mentality: have the fun, but avoid the lung cancer or the pregnancy. It is the omnipresent yen to push somebody else out of the way and become the fellow who's got everything. To quote Professor Siepmann again: "This amorality is endemic. Society is shot through with it. You'd be amazed at how many students said Charles Van Doren was right. Anything for No. 1."

How does one go about computing the moral strength or weakness of an entire society? Crime and delinquency statistics, the divorce rate, the blight of pornography, the rising rate of illegitimate births, the high incidence of broken homes, the surge of mental illness, the percentage of youth rejected by the armed services, phenomena like the current practice of cheating in college examinations—these and other data and studies give some sort of an index. What else is needed?

Eugene Kinkead, an editor of *The New Yorker*, has written a book entitled *In Every War But One* (Norton). It attempts to analyze the hundreds of cubic yards of documents that the Department of the Army assembled in its deadly serious effort to find out what went wrong with American prisoners-of-war in Korea. Kinkead reveals, amid much other data, that the 229 Turks who were

captured and interned in Korea all managed to survive their imprisonment, and not a single one became a collaborator. One-third of our boys, on the other hand, became collaborators; and 38 per cent of them died. The Army found that GI's often abandoned fellow Americans who were wounded; they cursed their officers; the strong took food from the weak; in certain cases Americans sick with dysentery were rolled out into the cold to die; and this was done, not by their Chinese captors, but by fellow GI's. Turks, however, kept a high morale, shared food and nursed their sick back to health.

Heaven knows, the image of America that is refracted through these and other available statistics is enough to shake the most complacent of us. Nevertheless, the picture is incomplete. The big, bold headlines—ah, dear, freedom of the press!—tell us about the mad bombers, arsonists, sex maniacs, kidnapers, juvenile murderers, junkies and extortionists among us. They rarely highlight the millions of hard-working and dedicated people still in the land: surgeons, nurses, nuns, civil servants, artists, social workers, public school teachers, clergymen, firemen, policemen, truck drivers, scholars—and plain, everyday, indispensable fathers and mothers of growing families.

Then, too, a certain aroma of phoniness creeps at times into these discussions, making it all the more difficult to assess our true moral stature. We could well have done

without the tears and congratulatory salvos that greeted young Van Doren's public confession, which to many, by the way, was the most meretricious incident in the entire quiz-show mess. John Cogley, in the *Commonweal*, said Van Doren "did his greatest mischief and was guilty of the most shameful abuse of public confidence, not when he accepted money under false pretenses, but when he made his belated confession," which, he went on, while "humble" in the approved TV and Madison Avenue manner, "reeked with pride."

The Scapegoat

And, frankly, are we doing any better at genuinely unburdening our consciences than Van Doren did? We feel clean and noble when we excoriate the materialism around us. We manage to pin the blame on some scapegoat—working wives, or the New Deal, or high taxes, or John Dewey and the teachers colleges—leaving very little responsibility at our own doorsteps. Our excoriations would be far more convincing if we were readier with tax dollars for defense and for economic aid to less materialistic peoples; if we fought harder for the Negro; if our consciences were a bit more troubled over irrationalities in our immigration laws; if we worried a little more about the lot of the Puerto Ricans in our cities; if, having done our excoriating, we were prepared to sacrifice a slice of our time or a touch of our comfort to

the common good of the free world and the righting of injustices and inequities here at home.

A false note is sounded, too, by the realization that in large part our concern originates in fear that we may soon be overtaken, economically, by the purposeful Soviet Union. Can we honestly say our fear is the trepidation of God-fearing men—fear for ourselves and our souls and our fate, for the harvest of our sins and our wretched confusions? Or is it nothing but a camouflaged lust to cling on to the very possessions we protest are our undoing? There is reason to suspect that it may be the latter, that what we are really worried about is that the whole kit and caboodle of our American way of life—missiles and credit cards, Cadillacs and pop-up toasters, our freedoms, fun, filters and foolishness—is about to go down the drain. If so, then we do have reason to be concerned for ourselves and our future.

Our trouble is not simply that some Americans have air conditioners in their cars, or that an increasing number of our citizens are making down-payments on cabin cruisers. Their number is and will remain limited: even in our affluent society there is still plenty of personal poverty. The obligation of transcending and mastering material possessions presses harder on the few than on the many. The crasser brand of materialism, therefore, can be discounted as a real problem for the vast majority.

There is, however, a subtler prob-

lem which does touch us all. It goes by various names and is all the following things at once: a loss of faith, an obfuscation of reason, a failure of nerve, a loss of confidence, an intellectual and moral vacuum, a failure to maintain our grip on the Big Idea about ourselves and the world we inhabit.

Losing the Big Idea

What is really wrong, it seems to me, has to do with our loss of this Big Idea, by which I mean our loosening grasp on the meaning and purpose of human life in relation to a real order of objective and transcendent being. Our problem is that we no longer know who or what we are. We no longer collectively see ourselves as a people bound together by common affirmations, common assumptions, common loyalties to a commonly shared universe of values. For years we have viewed this American pluralism as a product of our freedom and as a source of immense strength. Now it is slowly dawning upon us that it can become a debilitating disease. This malady, which is now epidemic, affects rich and poor, young and old. It is as though all at once we had lost our identification papers. To make matters worse, we have not only let the Big Idea slip away, but it is no longer polite or even permissible to raise any of the Big Questions men have always asked about the Big Idea.

What are these Big Questions which, in the contemporary atmosphere of our official agnosticism,

may be asked and answered only behind the doors of the "home, church and synagogue"? To paraphrase a list of such questions prepared by Father John Courtney Murray, S.J., for *Religion and the State University* (University of Michigan Press, 1958): Where does man rank in the order of being, if there is an order of being? What is the nature of man? Is it of a piece with the nature of the cosmic universe? Is it to be understood in terms of the laws of the universe, whatever they may be? Or is there a difference between man and the rest of nature? Is the nature of man spiritual in a unique sense? What is man's destiny? Is it to be found and fulfilled beyond time in "another world"? What is the "sense" of history? Does history have some kind of finality? Or is the notion of "finality" meaningless? What can a man know? What do you mean when you say, "I know"? Are there varying degrees of knowledge and certitude? Can man's knowledge and love reach realities that are transcendent to the world of matter, space and time? Is there a God? What is God? Does God have a care for man? Has God entered the world of human history to accomplish a "redemption"? What is meant by "salvation"? What is meant by freedom, justice, order, law, authority, power, peace, virtue, sin, morality, religion?

Just now, in the United States and throughout the West, there is obviously no consensus as to how these and similar questions are to be answered. There is not even a

shared language of words and concepts with which the separated components of our society might begin to be able to discuss them. Yet, as recently as 75 years ago, in the academic world as well as in the realm of public affairs, the ancient heritage of such words and concepts, products of the scholastic tradition, was still in uneasy but *de facto* possession. Today, except in some of our colleges, the lines that once bound us to that heritage have been broken.

Once the ancient words and ideas had been widely discredited, a new lexicon of discourse took their place. It was a tongue which had been coming into more and more common usage since the 18th century, the language of Modernity—of science, experimentalism and positivism. Until almost yesterday, who would have dreamed of disputing Modernity? And yet, though it was so firmly in control just a little while back, today, in Father Murray's phrase, Modernity is "dissolving in disenchantment." The disenchantment has created a strange new situation, a sort of ideological interregnum. The seals of legitimacy, so to speak, have disappeared from its head and tongue. Though it still exercises a kind of caretaker government in our universities and elsewhere, the modern idiom of positivism is reenacting the old story of the emperor's clothes.

Need for a Public Philosophy

It is this sudden turn of events in the world of ideas, this breakdown

of the flimsy consensus of Modernity, that has brought us to that condition of moral vacuum which John Steinbeck and others perceive and deplore. More or less clearly we today realize that a post-modern era has commenced and that we are entering it in a state of intellectual nakedness. The pressing need for some sort of revival of the "public philosophy" of the West has come home to us. This, it would seem, is what these gathering storms of protest and criticism are all about.

Half a dozen years ago, in his essay on *The Public Philosophy*, Walter Lippmann insisted that in our "pluralized and fragmenting society a public philosophy with common and binding principles" must somehow be salvaged and reinstated. If we fail to revive and restore the consensus we once possessed, Lippmann warned, "... then the free and democratic nations face the totalitarian challenge without a public philosophy which free men believe in and cherish, with no public faith beyond a mere official agnosticism, neutrality and indifference. There is not much doubt how the struggle is likely to end if it lies between those who, believing, care very much—and those who, lacking belief, cannot care very much."

We know from the chapter he contributed to *Walter Lippmann and His Times* (Harcourt, Brace), a volume published last year to honor Mr. Lippmann on his seventieth birthday, that Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., was more than

a little scandalized by the stress the veteran columnist placed on the necessity of shoring up the "public philosophy" as a condition of the survival of our society. Mr. Lippmann had written: "I do not contend, though I hope, that the decline of Western society will be arrested if the teachers in our schools and universities come back to the great tradition of the public philosophy. But I do contend that the decline, which is already far advanced, cannot be arrested if the prevailing philosophers oppose this restoration and revival . . ."

However, as Schlesinger's reaction demonstrates—and he is not alone in his appraisal of Lippmann's thesis—the academic world is not as yet in the mood to accept responsibility for the difficult but still feasible task of restoring what Lippmann calls "a common conception of law and order which possesses a universal validity."

Meantime, each fresh week and month of our now lengthening post-modern experience serves to sharpen the issue and drive home its urgency. If we are really determined to fill the present void, we shall rediscover the words and begin to conceive the ideas with which to ask once again the Big Questions that every generation must answer. Thus, conceivably, if time is given us, we may even reclaim the Big Idea. If war is too important to be left to the generals, this present dilemma of ours is too terrible to be entrusted to the professors.

—A Forgotten Letter—

The religious issue raised in the national election campaign of 1908 drew the following letter from President Theodore Roosevelt. Dated and published after the election of his successor, William Howard Taft, Mr. Roosevelt's letter was a reply to J. C. Martin of Dayton, Ohio, who had written to him during the campaign.

November 6, 1908

MR. J. C. MARTIN,
DAYTON, OHIO.

MY DEAR SIR:

I HAVE received your letter, running in part as follows: "While it is claimed almost universally that religion should not enter into politics, yet there is no denying that it does, and the mass of the voters that are not Catholics will not support a man for any office, especially for President of the United States, who is a Roman Catholic. Since Taft has been nominated for President by the Republican party it is being circulated and is constantly urged as a reason for not voting for Taft that he is an infidel (Unitarian) and his wife and brother, Roman Catholics. . . . If his feelings are in sympathy with the Roman Catholic Church on account of his wife and brother being Catholics that would be objectionable to a sufficient number of voters to defeat him. On the other hand, if he is an infidel, that would be sure to mean defeat. . . . I am writing this letter for the sole purpose of giving Mr. Taft an opportunity to let the world know what his religious belief is."

I received many such letters as yours during the campaign, expressing dissatisfaction with Mr. Taft on religious grounds; some of them on the ground that he was a Unitarian, and others on the ground that he was suspected to be in sympathy with Catholics. I did not answer any of these letters during the campaign, because I regarded it as an outrage even to agitate such a question as a man's religious convictions, with the purpose of influencing a political election. But now that the campaign is over, when there is opportunity for men calmly to consider whither such propositions as those you make in your letter would lead, I wish to invite them to consider them, and I have selected your letter to answer because you advance both the objections commonly

urged against Mr. Taft, namely: that he is a Unitarian and also that he is suspected of sympathy with the Catholics.

You ask that Mr. Taft shall "let the world know what his religious belief is." This is purely his own private concern: and it is a matter between him and his Maker, a matter for his own conscience; and to require it to be made public under penalty of political discrimination is to negative the first principles of our government, which guarantee complete religious liberty and the right to each man to act in religious affairs as his own conscience dictates.

Mr. Taft never asked my advice in the matter, but if he had asked it I should have emphatically advised him against thus stating publicly his religious belief. The demand for a statement of a candidate's religious belief can have no meaning except that there may be discrimination for or against him because of that belief. Discrimination against the holder of one faith means retaliatory discrimination against men of other faiths. The inevitable result of entering upon such a practice would be an abandonment of our real freedom of conscience and reversion to the dreadful conditions of religious dissension which in so many lands have proved fatal to true liberty, to true religion and to all advance in civilization.

To discriminate against a thoroughly upright citizen because he belongs to some particular church, or because, like Abraham Lincoln, he has not avowed his allegiance to any church is an outrage against that liberty of conscience which is one of the foundations of American life. You are entitled to know whether a man seeking suffrage is a man of clean and upright life, honorable in all his dealings with his fellows, and fit by qualifications and purpose to do well in the great office for which he is a candidate; but you are not entitled to know matters which lie purely between himself and his Maker.

If it is proper or legitimate to oppose a man for being a Unitarian as was John Quincy Adams, for instance; as is the Rev. Edward Everett Hale, at the present moment Chaplain of the Senate, and an American of whose life all good Americans are proud, then it would be equally proper to support or oppose a man because of his views on justification by faith, or the method of administering the sacrament or the gospel of salvation by works. If you once enter on such a career there is absolutely no limit at which you can legitimately stop. So much for your objections to Mr. Taft because he is a Unitarian. Now for your objections to him because you think his wife and brother to be Roman

Catholics. As it happened, they are not; but if they were, or if he were a Roman Catholic himself, it ought not to affect in the slightest degree any man's supporting him for the position of President.

You say that "the mass of the voters that are not Catholics will not support a man for any office, especially for President of the United States, who is a Roman Catholic." I believe that when you say this you foully slander your fellow countrymen. I do not for one moment believe that the mass of our fellow citizens can be influenced by such narrow bigotry as to refuse to vote for any thoroughly upright and fit man because he happens to have a particular religious creed.

Such a consideration should never be treated as a reason for either supporting or opposing a candidate for a political office. Are you aware that there are several States in this Union where the majority of the people are now Catholics? I should reprobate in the severest terms the Catholics who, in those States (or in any other States), refused to vote for the most fit man because he happened to be a Protestant, and my condemnation would be exactly as severe for Protestants who, under reversed circumstances, refused to vote for a Catholic.

In public life, I am happy to say I have known very many men who were elected and constantly re-elected to office in districts where the great majority of their constituents were of a different religious belief. I know Catholics who have for many years represented constituencies mainly Protestant and Protestants who have for many years represented constituencies mainly Catholic; and among the Congressmen whom I knew particularly well was one man of Jewish faith, who represented a district in which there were hardly any Jews at all. All of these men, by their very existence in political life, refute the slander you have uttered against your fellow Americans.

I believe that this Republic will endure for many centuries. If so, there will doubtless be among its Presidents Protestants and Catholics, and very probably, at some time, Jews. I have consistently tried while President to act in relation to my fellow Americans of Catholic faith as I hope that any future President who happens to be a Catholic will act toward his fellow Americans of Protestant faith. Had I followed any other course I should have felt that I was unfit to represent the American people.

In my Cabinet at the present moment there sit side by side Catholic and Protestant, Christian and Jew, each man chosen because in my belief he is peculiarly fit to exercise on behalf of all our people the

duties of the office to which I have appointed him. In no case does the man's religious belief in any way influence his discharge of his duties, save as it makes him more eager to act justly and uprightly in his relations to all men.

The same principles that have obtained in appointing the members of my Cabinet, the highest officials to whom is entrusted the work of carrying out all the important policies of my administration, are the principles upon which all good Americans should act in choosing, whether by election or appointment, the men to fill any office, from the highest to the lowest in the land.

Yours truly,
THEODORE ROOSEVELT

An Apology

The CATHOLIC MIND apologizes to Prof. O. Hobart Mowrer, Research Professor of Psychology at the University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., for the unauthorized use that was made in our March-April issue of his address of last September to the American Psychological Association convention in Cincinnati, Ohio. We reprinted this address from a mimeographed release that had been sent us, incorrectly assuming that permission had been given for its total reproduction in our pages. Further apology is due Professor Mowrer for the regrettable fact that his name was misspelled by the CATHOLIC MIND.—Ed.

In the face of proposals that birth-control programs be made part of U.S. aid overseas, what course can Catholic citizens follow except to oppose as public policy a measure rejected as immoral by the Catholic conscience?

Birth Control and Foreign Aid*

JAMES O'GARA
Managing Editor, COMMONWEAL

THE BIRTH control issue is one of the most divisive in American life, rubbing feelings raw and constantly exacerbating Protestant-Catholic relations. By its very nature, of course, this is a question on which it is easy to wound and difficult to heal. But even granting this fact, the controversy over birth control has always been more bitter than it needed to be, and neither Protestants nor Catholics can evade blame on this score.

The plain fact is that over the years bad arguments have been made on each side and charges hurled that would have been better

left unsaid. Some day, I hope, we will begin speaking to rather than at each other on this and even more important questions—both those on which we disagree and those on which we stand together. But that day, obviously, has not yet dawned.

Leaving aside the unnecessary bitterness that has marred the discussion, however, the difference between Protestants and Catholics on the birth control issue is real. In this circumstance, although we all have a right to expect that exchanges on the matter remain within decent limits, controversy is inevitable. But to me it seems most unfortunate that

*Reprinted from *Worldview*, 170 E. 84 St., N.Y. 21, N.Y., January, 1960.

this explosive subject has been injected into the debate over foreign aid.

The Underdeveloped Countries

By now almost everyone is familiar with the general outlines of the problem. The underdeveloped countries are experiencing sharp increases in population, not because of any marked increase in the birth rate but because of a phenomenal decline in the death rate. This de-

crease is directly attributable to the importation from the West of some of the blessings of modern medicine and sanitation, in the shape of such techniques as mass inoculations, D.D.T. spraying, and the like.

The underdeveloped countries are thus going through a process associated with the rise of science and modern medicine which the West has already experienced, but there are significant differences. The decline of the death rate in the nations

Where Government's Role Ends

FOR THE GOVERNMENT OFFICIALLY to sponsor contraception as part of its foreign aid program to "overpopulated" countries would, in effect, be to set itself up as official adjudicator over the conflicting moral philosophies held by sections of the American people. This, under our conception of constitutional democracy, the Government has neither the right nor authority to do. With us, the state is not the supreme moral teacher and guide that it is in totalitarian systems; it is a carefully defined and limited social agency serving to maintain public order, promote public welfare, and (in certain cases) effectuate moral purposes so far as there is a substantial consensus among the American people on the moral issues.

We all understand this, even if we do not often put it into words. The very same people who demand that contraception be made part of our public policy abroad, even though a substantial part of the American people find contraception to be morally wrong, would be outraged and resentful if our Government made abortion part of its public policy in aiding Japan, where abortion has official approval. They would not be placated by being assured that the Japanese population problem is a serious one and that abortion was a technically effective way of meeting it; and the reason they would not be placated is that to them abortion is first of all a *moral* problem. They would not want to give the Government the right to make moral judgments overturning the moral consensus of the nation.

of Western Europe was a gradual thing, and it was followed, not too slowly, by a comparable decline in the birth rate. Before this rough balance was achieved, the population doubled and then more than doubled again.

In the case of the underdeveloped nations, the death rate is falling abruptly rather than in easy stages, and the gap between births and deaths is very large. Thus while the world's population as a whole is

growing at the rate of 1.7 per cent annually, the growth rate in many underdeveloped countries is from 3 to 3.5 per cent annually. If present rates of growth continue, the population of the world in the next forty years will roughly double once again.

The Religious Conscience

In view of all this, it is clear that we must concern ourselves with the pressure of population growth upon

And yet today these very people demand that the Government set itself up as supreme moral judge by implementing their particular moral philosophy over against the moral philosophies held by other large and significant sections of the American people. Such an attitude, I suggest, is quite contrary to the ethos and tradition of our kind of constitutional democracy; and this would surely be obvious to all intelligent Americans did not the question emerge in a context of religio-political controversy which seems to preclude all sober and responsible consideration of issues.

Fortunately, President Eisenhower has been able to see things in their proper perspective. It is not for us, he has in effect said, to decide how other nations meet their population problems; we cannot set ourselves up as moral judge over them. If they want to employ methods which the American Government cannot officially support either because the American people find them morally repugnant (abortion), or because the American people are sharply divided on the moral issue (contraception), they—the nations we aid—can get their information and resources from private agencies, which are not restricted by the same considerations that limit the scope and functions of the Government. This is the way such problems have generally been met in the past, and it is a way that is in consonance with the genius of the American system.—WILL HERBERG, *lecturer at Drew University, author of Judaism and Modern Man and Protestant, Catholic, Jew, in WORLDVIEW, January 1960.*

available resources. But it is equally clear that proposals for dealing with the problem must be morally acceptable. Just as all religious men insist that there are limits beyond which we cannot go in a war even when national survival is at stake, so too proposals made in connection with the population problem must be carefully evaluated by the religious conscience.

On this question a Catholic can only say flatly that he differs with most of his neighbors. If I may cite an extreme case, I think all Americans would on moral grounds reject the idea of genocide as the solution to the population problem. I suspect, too, that most Americans would not favor sterilization on a mass scale and would refuse to endorse any program of planned abortions such as that which costs a million lives in Japan every year. It seems clear, though, that very many, perhaps most, Americans who are not Catholics favor birth control by mechanical or chemical means. On this the Catholic must dissent, for to the Catholic conscience not only genocide, sterilization and abortion but artificial methods of contraception are morally repugnant.

Given this fact, and in the face of proposals that such programs be made part of American aid overseas, what choice did the Catholic bishops of the United States have except to repeat once more the traditional Catholic position in the matter? And what course can Catholic citizens follow in good conscience except to oppose as public policy a

program rejected as immoral by the Catholic conscience?

This is the nub of the matter. But it is not to say that Catholics think mankind is doomed only to the classic Malthusian population checks of pestilence and plague, famine and war. Catholic social scientists point out that even the present population of the United States would have seemed incredible thirty years ago, and they are convinced that the world can support far more people than it now has or is likely to have.

What Catholic Thinkers Stress

Opposing artificial contraception on moral grounds, Catholic thinkers stress positive economic, social and political measures: the necessity of social justice on the international level, the development of natural resources, the creation of a true community of nations, the spread of education, the introduction of modern industrial methods, and the like. The difficulties here are great, of course, but the possibilities are tremendous; in some cases even such a simple matter as the substitution of a metal for a wooden plow can increase crop yield twenty or thirty per cent.

No doubt Catholic writers have sometimes oversimplified the possibilities in this direction, exaggerating the chances of quick advances and making light of the real difficulties. But this shoe does not only pinch the Catholic foot, for many of the most ardent advocates of birth control clinics overseas have not

faced up to the difficulties in their proposals either.

The people in the underdeveloped regions resist innovations of all sorts, and it can be expected that intrusion into traditional familial patterns will always be resisted far more strongly than changes in agricultural and industrial methods. The truth is that there is no easy solution to the problem of the underdeveloped countries, and in this situation it is my opinion that the United States should devote itself to the expansion of their productive capacity rather than to birth control. On this point I take it that I am in agreement with Paul Hoffman, head of the U.N. special fund for aid to underdeveloped nations, for he recently warned against imagining that birth control is "an answer to the problem of the development of less developed countries."

We must, I think, honestly face the fact that the have-not nations in once-colonial regions have a far greater claim on the countries of the West than we have yet been willing to admit. North America, for example, has less than ten per cent of the world's population, yet this ten per cent receives forty per cent of the world's income. Every day millions of families in other countries receive less food than that discarded from American tables. Can we, then, claim to be doing all that should be done to help the underdeveloped nations expand their productive capacities?

From a long-range view, experience indicates that the birth rate in

the underdeveloped countries will not stay at its present level indefinitely. But the next four or five decades are crucial. Expansion of productive capacity in the underdeveloped nations on the scale that is essential will take billions of dollars annually over a long period, and there is no chance at all that these countries can finance a project of this size without our aid.

Since the birth control issue is one of the most divisive in American life, on which a reasonable consensus is impossible, simple political prudence suggests that this matter be left to the nations concerned and to the conscientious convictions of their own people. To insist that birth control be made a part of our foreign aid program can only divide the country needlessly, imperil the program itself and ultimately hurt rather than help the underdeveloped countries.

In the present controversy over birth control and foreign aid, religious-minded men have allowed themselves to be side-tracked into a bitter and essentially pointless dispute that could have disastrous effects. This strikes me as an act of political folly which only obscures the central fact on which we could all agree: the urgent necessity of an expanded, long-term effort by all the nations of the West to enlarge productive capacity in the underdeveloped nations. Unless this is done, on a scale far beyond anything we have yet attempted, peace in our time is impossible, birth control or no.

The American brand of clericalism is so deeply entrenched that it is hardly recognizable for what it is. It has remained to hinder the lay apostolate after its causes have been largely eliminated.

Clericalism in America*

JOHN B. MANNION
Executive Secretary
North American Liturgical Conference

IT WASN'T until after I had accepted Mr. Murray's invitation to participate in the Columbia Lecture Series that I learned precisely what my subject was to be. I knew it was in the general field of the lay apostolate, but I had no idea that I had accepted the rather delicate task of appraising our present-day Catholic lay organizations. The assignment is not only delicate (for who wants to risk losing friends?) but, for me at least, it is somewhat presumptuous. However, an Irishman with an audience was never known to hesitate. And who am I

to disturb the peaceful sleep of my ancestors?

I say it is presumptuous of me to speak on this subject because it is a simple and obvious fact that I am no historian or theologian—no keen, observant sociologist who has peeked and probed into every K. of C. hall and church basement in the country. I am no super organization man who revised Robert's Rules of Order, or who delights in group dynamics, togetherness, Congresses, conventions, or monster rallies.

Quite seriously, the topic is stag-

*The third in a series of Columbia Lectures sponsored by Highland Park Council, Knights of Columbus, St. Paul, Minn., February 1, 1960.

gering. Consider for a moment the extent of the Catholic lay organizations in this country. We number about 40,000,000 people. I haven't met all of them, but all I have met seem to carry a wallet full of membership cards. It would be impossible to estimate with any degree of accuracy the number of organizations and organized activity groups. My guess, and it is nothing more, would be that there are about 100,000 such groups in the U.S. This includes study and discussion clubs, The Legion of Mary, Holy Name, Altar and Rosary Societies; Knights of Columbus, St. John and St. Peter Claver; Sodalities; Catholic Daughters and Daughters of Isabella; parish men's clubs, dads' clubs, mothers' clubs, couples' clubs, cub scouts and scouts of all kinds; teen clubs, CYO, PTA, YCS, YCW, CCD, CFM; lawyers' guilds, doctors' guilds, nurses' guilds, teachers' guilds; third orders, secular institutes, lay missionaries, retreat groups, alumni associations, First Friday Clubs, booster clubs, bowling clubs, Serra clubs; clubs for Irish, Polish, Czechs, Lithuanians, Germans, Italians, and veterans. I may have run out of breath, but not organizations.

The question is: are they doing any good? And the answer is yes, for some of them; a resounding no for others.

Perhaps that's unfair. Perhaps a better question would be: are our Catholic lay organizations making a mature contribution to the mission of the Church? Are they making a Christian impact on society?

Ah, that's a question of a different color. But it may be that, too, is unfair. Certainly we cannot ask it of every Catholic group in the country. Not all organizations were established to contribute directly to the mission of the Church. So let us eliminate from our discussion some of the purely social, or insurance, or benevolent associations, the devotional types, those with limited, specific purposes, such as St. Vincent de Paul and its magnificent charity work. Let us consider tonight only those organizations of a general nature, those groups founded for broad, Catholic purposes—those which lay claim to the term "apostolic" or "Catholic Action," those which claim to serve the Church—through parishes or Catholic membership.

In this group we may include most of the general organizations for men and women, the Knights of Columbus, and so on.

The Moving Spirit

To evaluate or appraise these groups, we must recall the circumstances and factors which affected their growth and helped to form their traditions, and which today influence their nature and activities. Organizations are made up of people and ideas. They are as good, as efficient as the people who make them up; they are as noble, as valuable to the Church as the ideas which move them. So let us ask: What is the spirit behind the typical Catholic lay organization?

The most common lay groups as

we know them today came to be because it was felt by bishops, priests and laymen that the laity should in some way be organized for the good of the Church and for the general welfare of the people themselves. They were an attempt to bind the people closer to the Church, to foster the spiritual or devotional lives of the faithful, to provide Catholic fellowship or association in a pluralistic society, to serve the financial needs of the Church, or some combination of these reasons.

The tradition affecting most general parish organizations was developed in a time when the role of the laity was not as clear as it is now. In addition, the Church was then preoccupied with serious problems—serving hordes of immigrants and language groups, a shortage of priests, the demands of a staggering educational and building program, and so on. You don't need me to describe the Church's situation in the first quarter of this century and the latter half of the last century. It was a busy, struggling Church and it accomplished wonders.

But it is not unfair to say that this period contributed little to our understanding of the layman, or to our employment of the layman in the apostolic work of the Church. His position remained more or less as it had been for some few centuries—largely unappreciated and neglected. He was asked to "practice the Faith," to support his parish, to obey the rules and regula-

tions of the Church, especially concerning marriage and the education of his children. More than this in religion was the business of the priests. Indeed the clergy, during our immigrant days, were the leaders in many fields. They knew the strange ways of this new country and were sought out for legal advice, help in finding a job; they were all things to all their flock.

And out of this great labor of our priests developed a dependence which came to be a sort of clericalism. A creation of the laity (although it doesn't seem to have been seriously discouraged by the clergy), this American brand of clericalism entrenched itself so deeply that it was hardly recognizable for what it was. And it remained after its causes had been largely eliminated or brought under control. Its spirit carried over into the twentieth century, and it is with us today. Thank God, it is not so strong as it once was. Thank God, it is fading under the bright light of leadership we have had in Rome and among some of our priests and bishops.

Today we are in a time of change. There is a resurgence of the laity towards its proper position—a resurgence that is, however, retarded by the remnants of our clericalism.

Lingered Clericalism

It is interesting to note just where the fog-patches of clericalism lingered. As the Church passed its "immigrant stage," and Catholics grew in numbers, education and social acceptance, the priest no

longer needed to serve as interpreter, lawyer, employment agent. Quite obviously, Catholics were just as competent in secular affairs as anyone else, including the clergy. Ah, but in matters of religion, the layman sought and received no better position than his grandparents had. What was the effect of an emergency, minimal program, designed to "preserve the Faith," had come to be the layman's unquestioned position. He felt no real competence, had no desire for greater competence and was given none.

It would be worth a moment or two to examine just how our peculiar brand of clericalism manifested itself. We may detect it in the exaggerated respect given the clergy—a respect tinged with fear of authority, fear of men who were somehow different, aloof, mysterious, men who knew a great deal more than those in their charge. Who would ever argue or disagree with Father? He had all the answers; he must be right. And besides, it just wouldn't be proper to go against anything a priest says. Since this attitude prevailed especially in matters of religion, Catholic organizations were preoccupied with it. Every detail had to have Father's approval. The poor priest was called upon to be a new Solomon—but in such trivial matters! "What should we serve for refreshments, Father? How much should we order? Would you mind if we bought it at Nolan's Store? Do you think a quarter donation is too much to ask?" And so on and on, until it's a wonder that

Father didn't run screaming from every meeting he attended.

After a generation or two, Father became quite accustomed to it all and just naturally treated the people as older children. He knew he would be consulted on everything and he expected it. "Whom should we nominate for president? Would it be all right to distribute this pamphlet? What should we do at our next meeting? They want us to attend a diocesan convention; should we go?" The priests were the only real leaders the organizations had; the laity were followers. And both sides were happy.

Listen to what Pope Pius XII had to say on this subject:

It would be minimizing the real nature of the Church and her social character to distinguish in her a purely active element, the ecclesiastical authorities, and, on the other hand, a purely passive element, the laymen. All the members of the Church . . . are called upon to collaborate in the building and the perfecting of the Mystical Body of Christ. They are all free persons and must, therefore, be active.

Free persons. If some young whippersnapper like me would have ever told my grandfather he was a "free person" in the Church and must be active in building up the Body of Christ, he would probably have taken off for the rectory at a gallop, calling "heretic!" over his shoulder.

Please do not leave here tonight thinking I am advocating anti-clericalism. All I am trying to do is to help us examine our organiza-

tions so we can clear out the traces of clericalism which still stand in the way of progress and development. There can be no effective lay leadership or initiative until both clergy and laity recognize the true nature of the lay state in religion.

Again I refer to Pius XII on this subject:

The tasks of the Church are too immense today to leave room for petty disputes. In order to preserve the sphere of action of each, it is sufficient that all should possess enough spirit of faith, disinterestedness and mutual esteem and confidence.

Respect for the dignity of the priest has always been one of the most typical characteristics of the Christian community. On the other hand, the layman also has rights, and the priest on his part must recognize them.

To summarize this point, it was in an atmosphere of clericalism that our traditions concerning lay organizations developed. Neither clergy nor laity consciously preserved the clerical spirit; they continued it, yes, but they were simply passing on what had been given to them. And they have given it, in some measure, to most of us.

In this sketchy background, we may observe that our contemporary lay activity is hampered by two obstacles: first, a terribly inadequate understanding of religion, the Church, the Mystical Body, the role of the layman; second, our ingrained clericalism.

These two problems—along with a few other factors—seem to have resulted in an attitude which makes

their solution extremely difficult. The layman has come to accept this tradition as fully natural. This is the way the Church has always been and should be. This is Catholicism. There is nothing more, he thinks. Being a Catholic means simply that one accepts the fact that ours is the one true, infallible Church which has the whole, unchanging truth and if one adheres to its laws and practices, tries hard to be good and prayerful, salvation is probably assured. Sure, he realizes there is a lot he doesn't know about religion, but he's not quite convinced that he has to know more. He manages to get along very well the way things are, and after all, "we aren't expected to be theologians."

Intellectual Apathy

This is intellectual apathy in a most fatal form. We have come to be satisfied with a bare minimum. We have accepted a diet which will keep us from starvation, but a banquet awaits in the upper room. This is the inadequate understanding of religion I mentioned a moment ago. And because it is inadequate, it fails all too often.

We are told that about 40 per cent of the baptized Catholics in the United States do not attend Sunday Mass regularly. Forty per cent! Something is failing.

It is of little wonder, then, in view of our habit of intellectual apathy, that we are slow to respond to the Popes of the 20th century

who have been urging us to plunge more deeply into the mysteries of our Faith. We really aren't convinced that it is necessary—or even that it would be interesting.

And so, many of our parish groups go on as they have for generations, satisfied that they are fulfilling their proper role by giving Catholic men or women a chance to get together socially, by raising money, by promoting certain religious or devotional practices, and by generally encouraging the people to "stay close to the Church and live good Catholic lives." These are certainly unobjectionable objectives, but they are hardly meeting the demands of the day. They are hardly what is meant when the Popes call us to the "*consecratio mundi*," the consecration of the world.

In short, then, too many parish organizations today are operating under principles and goals which were developed 25, 50 or more years ago. They are drastically behind the times. And they are not inclined to change because they quite sincerely believe that their approach to the work of laymen in the Church is all that it is supposed to be.

I have painted a bleak picture. Let us turn now to the signs of hope. Earlier I said that we are in a time of change, that there is a resurgence of the laity underway. And there is. Not all the laity are caught up in it as yet, but there is no denying that a change is taking place.

Certainly, we must commend the

efforts of such Catholic family activity as the Christian Family Movement and Cana, and such youth movements as the Young Christian Students and the Young Christian Workers. In some dioceses, the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine is strong and effective. Some Diocesan Councils of Catholic Men and Women are making significant progress. The rise of professional sodalities, and the reform of some older sodalities are highly encouraging. And we cannot fail to mention the Grail for young women, the various lay missionary associations, the liturgical movement. There are others, to be sure, but I needn't mention them all here, nor would I claim to know them all.

Traditional Organizations

But what of our more traditional organizations: the Knights of Columbus, Holy Name Societies, and the various parish men's and women's groups? Are they not to be found in the front ranks of the lay apostolate at its best? In recent years, it has been fashionable in avant-garde circles to dismiss them as a sad hangover from a bad night in the Church's past. Although I would be the last to defend the mature apostolicity of the Knights as a group, or all Holy Name Societies, or all parish sodalities, I do not hesitate to say that some of these groups deserve the high praise and gratitude of the Church for the invaluable contribution they make to the work of Christ. Admittedly there

are too few of this caliber, but to condemn them categorically is rash and unwarranted.

There is nothing intrinsic about older Catholic organizations which makes it impossible for them to be effective today. Their vitality, their apostolicity depends upon the leaders of each local unit. So rather than abandon the traditional organizations, let us try to revitalize them, inspire them, train them; let us capitalize on their vast, loyal membership which includes millions of well-intentioned Catholics.

What would we have them do? Well, we might begin to see an answer if we consider that there are two broad, fundamental purposes applicable to most general lay groups. First, they should provide their members with the opportunity to share actively and directly in the apostolic mission of the Church. Second, they should so educate and inspire their members that they are better able to lead their individual lives as articulate witnesses for Christ.

On the first point. I don't need my parish men's club to provide me with the chance to have a beer with the boys. And neither do you. We don't need the Church to show us sports films or travelogues. Let us conclude, then, that the social or recreational aspects of Catholic organizations should be of secondary, incidental interest only.

Our primary concern must be with works of the lay apostolate. The great and saintly Pope Pius XII, when speaking to the second World

Congress of the Lay Apostolate, said this: "The lay apostolate consists in this, that laymen undertake tasks deriving from the mission Christ entrusted to His Church." The mission of the Church is to teach, to rule, to sanctify. The ruling authority of the Church rests in the hierarchy, and we have no share in it. But the command to "Go, teach all nations," is a command directed to all Christians. The mission of the Church to sanctify the world and the people of the world is a mission in which we have a very real share.

Aspects of the Apostolate

We are teaching when we cooperate with the work of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, most especially when we actually conduct religion classes for children in public schools. We teach when we help to take the faith to others by promoting information or inquiry classes, by conducting "open houses" in which we invite non-Catholics to visit our churches and schools and learn more about us. We are teaching when we use our meeting programs to educate the people in matters of the faith, in the social teachings of the Church, the liturgy, etc. We are teaching when we promote study clubs, discussion clubs, parish libraries.

We are sanctifying when we conduct programs which lead our brethren to the sources of grace and spiritual growth which the Church makes available to us—when we lead them to more intelligent, fre-

quent participation in the Mass—when we lead them to retreats and days of recollection—when we lead them to spiritual reading and meditation, when we lead them to family prayer and practices which will fill our Catholic homes with the light and spirit of Christ.

These are at least some of the things that our Catholic lay organizations should be doing, especially in parishes. In 1946, the Holy Father was speaking to a group of Cardinals and he said: "The laity must be given a sense, not of belonging to the Church—but of being the Church. They are the Church." The parish has been called the whole Church in miniature. The whole Church is there. The truth, the authority and the means of our sanctification. The people who make up this parish *are* the Church in their locality. If the work of the Church, if the work of Christ is to be done, all those who form the Mystical Body must do their share. If only part of the Body works, only part of the work will be done. Each of us has a unique contribution to make; no one can make it for us. Christ's work is our work. The parish's work is our work.

Our parish organizations, therefore, should be in close cooperation with the pastor, serving the needs and problems of the parish. What are the needs and problems of the parish? Let's find out. Do we have large numbers of baptized Catholics not practicing the faith? Do we have children not receiving religious instructions? Is the Church misun-

derstood among our non-Catholic neighbors? Is there racial or religious bigotry? Is our housing adequate? Are our youth being taken care of? Are there poor among us who need our help? Do we need a parish Credit Union? What kind of adult education program should we have? What community groups are engaged in work affecting us? Shouldn't we cooperate with them? And most importantly, what are the spiritual, material and apostolic problems of the parish as our pastor sees them? Let us ask ourselves these and many other questions and find out what the problems are. Then let us direct our organizational energies towards them so that the life and love and truth of Christ may become vital in our corner of His vineyard.

These are some aspects of the apostolate in which we should be active as an organization. Apart from this group work, I said that our societies should prepare their members for their individual Christian witness in the world. Again I quote from Pope Pius XII's address to the second World Congress of the Lay Apostolate. "The *consecratio mundi* (consecration of the world) is essentially the work of the laymen themselves, of men who are intimately a part of economic and social life and who participate in the government and legislative assemblies." In other words, if the institutions which make up our society are to be transformed under the influence of Christ, these institutions must be changed by those

who make them up, by people—by those who are bearers of Christ. The Archbishop of Hartford put it this way:

The lay apostolate is not one in which the people help the priest to do the priest's work. On the contrary, in the real lay apostolate the priest helps the layman to do the layman's work. Only the layman has competence in the social apostolate. It is only the layman and not the priest who can bring the social teachings of the Church into his union, into the factory, into the political arena. It is only through the layman that these areas can be truly Christianized.

This does not mean that we are trained spies to infiltrate labor unions or business management or politics. No. It means that you and I and all Christians must be so formed in Christ that nothing about us can ever be separated from Him. There is no such thing as a part-time Christian. We are marked for all eternity as a member of God's chosen family. Body and soul we are to be bearers of Christ and at no time or place, in no action of body, intellect, or will can we separate ourselves from the seal which signs us as one of God's chosen people.

The Christian Sense

This is how the world is to be sanctified, consecrated by Christians who know what they really are. The sad fact is we have lost the sense of being Christian. We don't know what it means to be a Christian. We don't seem to grasp that our life in the world is our voca-

tion, that we are to achieve our sanctification by becoming as much like Christ as we can in the life and times and circumstances in which He has placed us. We do not seem to realize that we cannot choose to be "a good, average Catholic." There is no such choice. We are called to perfection. We are called to climb to that spiritual peak where we can say with St. Paul, "Now not I, but Christ lives in me."

Is this the message, the good news, being given to laymen today? Or are we being told by our leaders, "You men and women are the cream of the crop, the shining flower of our Catholic laity," as though the mere fact of our membership in an organization gave claim to being a "better than average" Catholic?

Today, more than ever, the Church needs to use every means to communicate the fullness of the Gospel to the faithful. And Catholic lay organizations can be an eminently effective way of communicating the whole meaning of Christianity. In meetings and programs and activities of various kinds, we can cultivate among the members a more profound understanding of their faith, a more profound spirituality, a more profound apostolate.

Today, the Church needs a vision of itself, a clearer insight into God's magnificent plan for His people. We need to grasp that God is forging a supernatural community, that He is drawing mankind to Himself as His sons, that we come to Him with Christ, in Christ, through Christ.

The businessman does not achieve his satisfaction in the grubby pursuit of the dollar but rather in answering a challenge that calls for imagination, foresight, idealism and daring.

The Businessman— His Civic and Social Responsibility*

**W. SEAVEY JOYCE, S.J.
Dean, College of Business Administration
Boston College**

IT IS NOT unusual for an institution, as it grows older, to seek additional respectability. In this respect business is relatively modest. For while it is the oldest of the trades, it is only in rather recent years that it has claimed for itself the status of a profession. Since our own school has now reached its twenty-first year and is, therefore, an officially mature institution, it is perhaps not inappropriate for us to devote some thoughts to business as a profession.

A profession implies both an ascertainable body of knowledge, which the professional person is presumed to have mastered, and a decent ethical code, by which the professional person is presumed to be guided in the exercise of his office. Today we can claim that the businessman has both of these, even though the curriculum in our schools is being somewhat critically re-examined and although our moral code may be neither so precise nor so enforceable as, for example, in

*An address at the Annual Alumni Banquet, College of Business Administration, Boston College, Boston, Mass., November 14, 1959.

the medical profession. I think the term profession also implies a kind of idealism and it is this that I particularly mean to discuss.

The idea of a profession has always been surrounded with a certain dignity—an aurora. We think of the profound jurist or magistrate, dedicated to safeguarding the laws—the social structure—by which we live; of the doctor, vowed to the preservation of life itself; of the priest, the *pontifex*, bridging the gap between this life and the world beyond; of the teacher, molding the minds and morals of the young to love and thirst for the true and beautiful and good. Does the businessman deserve to be ranked with these quite dignified and august personages? Has his calling the same importance and prestige?

Business as a Career

The answer to this question is manifold. In the first place, business as a career today can charge and challenge the widest and most varied interests and ambitions. Think of the mammoth size, the bewildering variety, the astounding new developments and techniques of American business. It's not possible to keep pace with them all.

But, in spite of its enormous size and scope, American enterprise is not concerned with the production of goods and services only. One of the most significant characteristics of business is its growing social consciousness. This is true within the firm itself—especially in the larger and more advanced companies. For

example, the department of Personnel Relations is an important part of every major firm. And the job of this department is not merely to devise ways of manipulating employees. Rather it seeks to understand their grievances and problems and, where possible, to provide solutions.

Again, industry is conscious of public relations. An intelligent management knows that good public relations are important and that these cannot be founded on deception. Public relations express a firm's desire to be understood in the best sense possible—but always honestly. Public relations must be sincere to be effective.

But the basic acceptance of a social philosophy goes far beyond such matters as sound personnel and public relations, important as these are. Today the social philosophy of business is based upon the frank, direct acceptance of social responsibility. In this sense the social concern of industry extends far beyond the walls of the individual firm. Obviously this represents a marked change from the characteristic viewpoint of business during the last century (although, even so far as the last is concerned, there has probably been a somewhat unfair appraisal of its philosophy). What matters is that today business is expressly committed to the assumption of social and civic responsibility. This is evidenced, for example, by business support to education. We cannot encourage this enough and we hope it will grow. Again, busi-

ness contributions to the community fund and to similar charities are now taken for granted.

Civic Concern

And business involvement in civic concerns has gone beyond even this. In all of our major cities the businessmen, the business leaders themselves, have become deeply involved in community problems. Pittsburgh and Philadelphia and Newark and St. Louis are conspicuous examples. In our own city of Boston there has been a conspicuous amount of civic concern on the part of business leaders. The Chamber of Commerce and its affiliated groups and the Municipal Research Bureau have been supplemented by the Civic Progress Committee and the Greater Boston Economic Study Committee. Our own citizen seminars and their related programs have been supported enthusiastically. This degree of involvement and concern is extended to the whole political and industrial climate of the area. What can be done to improve this climate, to keep it healthy, sound and good? What can best promote the welfare of the total community?

All these interests have not reduced the productivity of business but have increased it. Our gross national product soars higher and higher. Even while our leisure time increases, our output of services and goods surpasses our dreams. As you face Fulton Hall you will notice two seals, one on the left and one on the right of the building. The inscription on the seal to the left

reads "*Labor vincit omnia improbus*" ("Persistent labor conquers all"). The businessman has engaged in the most persistent and arduous of all labor, that is in the mental, administrative effort necessary to train, master, develop, and coordinate all of nature's resources and energy and all of man's talents and imaginations. And he has put these to work in the productive process.

But the impact of the businessman transcends even the domestic scene. He emerges as our best ambassador; for it is not our loans of dollars but our "know how," our commerce, even our foreign subsidiaries, that have made us known to other nations—not always without jealousy. But, as the inscription on the seal to the right of Fulton Hall tells us, "*Commercium est alma et sedula pacis altrix*," ("Business is the gentle yet persistent nourisher of peace"). People who trade together don't fight together. They may have disputes but not battles.

The Cosmic Challenge

Today the businessman faces a challenge on a cosmic front. The challenge of Russia today is not ideological. If we were to grant that the materialistic, irreligious, naive, and immature ideology of Marxist-Communism—and this is still the only basic ideology Communism has—poses a serious threat to our values of freedom, mutual tolerance and respect, and religious dedication, we should be selling our own values far too short. Neither does it now appear that the Russian's challenge in

the foreseeable future is a military one. The threat of war evokes too fearsome a threat of retaliation.

The big threat is that Russia may outstrip us at our own game; for the vast resources of the Eurasian land mass—which consists overwhelmingly of Red China, Russia and their satellites, and from which Western Europe sticks out only as a pitifully small peninsula—are mobilized as one vast technological machine. Its physical techniques are modeled on the methods developed by the older industrial nations. Its managerial techniques are a travesty of those practiced in a free economy. Such methods are possible only with the rejection of the human values that we cherish. Yet, beyond question, the rate of growth in the physical output of Russia and of China, too, has been terrifyingly fast. The challenge the businessman faces today is nothing short of this. Can he, operating in the framework of a free economy, recognizing human values and social commitments, continue to demonstrate the practical effectiveness and the superiority of American enterprise, as compared to the dictated technology of the Communist state?

The practical impact of success in this conflict cannot be too much emphasized. The spread of communism in new areas, the strengthening of its grasp on new peoples, will be vastly accelerated, if it appears to demonstrate that, as an economic way of life, it has more to offer to those peoples who for the first time are becoming con-

scious of wider needs and are daring to desire more from life. And conversely, the success of America and our allies in remaining economically strong and growing ever stronger will have its impact on these same underdeveloped, underprivileged peoples, especially if we can teach them the way and help them in their efforts to grow in self-respectability and human decency.

Such is the challenge, the profession of the businessman. He controls the vastest store of wealth and resources in the world's history. He aims, not only at the satisfaction of human needs and desires; he tries to anticipate these and to suggest new areas of human satisfaction. He expands production but at the same time recalls that human resources are the most precious of all so that, even while production expands, leisure increases. The businessman emerges as a leader in his local community. Meeting upon meeting consumes his time. He persuades the stockholders and contributes from his own pocket to the support of the community and the issues and problems that abound in it. It is his job to keep the free world free. To do this, he must keep it strong.

In all this he does not cease to be human. He must expect to be misunderstood. A successful businessman, prominent in local affairs, who had devoted long hours to a non-salaried public office, once told me that you must sometimes feel satisfied for your efforts if you escape with your reputation. Of course,

the real rewards and satisfaction of a job well done go far beyond this.

The businessman must therefore be a person of stolid and persistent application, of daring imagination, of dedication to ideals. Working in a rapidly changing, advancing, dynamic environment, he must be able to hold fast to ancient and tried truths and yet be ever ready to venture upon new plans. In choosing alternatives he must be realistic and hard. Yet he must fasten his hopes on dreams and distant visions. He is himself a kind of priest, for a priest, a *pontifex*, is in the literal meaning of that word a "bridge maker" and the businessman must fashion the bridge between material forces and energies and sublime human wants that they must serve. The completeness and variety of our hospitals, the excellence of our schools, the exquisiteness of our steeples and spires is an index of how well the businessman has succeeded.

The businessman is a kind of physician, too, for he contributes by his interest, by his support, and by his personal participation to curing

the pressing ills of our society. He is a kind of magistrate for, in the pragmatic court where success is the only criterion, he must prove that our way of life, with freedom of occupation and choice, will continue to perform more successfully than any kind of slave economy however disguised.

And he is, finally, a teacher interested always in new methods and new techniques, ever testing and trying these, and in the very act of learning, teaching others by his success. But he teaches us, above all, that the businessman does not achieve his satisfaction in the grubby pursuit of the dollar but rather in fulfilling the broader aspects of his calling; in answering a challenge that calls for as much imagination, foresight, idealism and daring and that is fraught with as grave consequences and as precious possibilities as any challenge man can hear. Kings and emperors in a younger world did not hear a more resounding challenge than that to which the businessman harkens in our day. To answer this challenge effectively is the glory of his profession.

Undoubtedly the spearhead of the opposition to Kerala's Communists was the Catholic community. Without the assistance of other anti-Communist sections of the people, however, the Catholics would have been powerless to accomplish their objective.

How the Reds Lost Kerala*

LOUIS FONSECA, S.J.

THE REMOVAL of the Communist government of Kerala by a decree of the President of India on July 31, 1959 has been hailed all over India and the free world as a great victory for those who participated in the struggle against communism in that unfortunate State. An impartial observer can truly maintain that while the Communist party was freely elected as the legal and legitimate government of Kerala, it forfeited its right to remain in power because it had lost the confidence of the people. Here was no reference to a referendum, but the spontaneous mass up-

surge of a people who could not bear any longer the tyranny of a government that in the name of democracy and behind the facade of a democratic Indian Constitution tired to browbeat them into submission and strengthen its position in power by the most unscrupulous means.

It is good to realize that when the two parties were locked in a furious struggle for supremacy, public opinion in India as expressed in the newspapers and in the Lok Sabha in New Delhi was rather critical of the parties opposing the Communists, and described them as

*Reprinted from *Civiltà Cattolica*, Via di Porta Pinciana 1, Roma (319), Italy, January 16, 1960.

"forces of casteism, (and) communalism backed by religion." In addition to these prejudiced critics, quite a few responsible people feared that similar mass upsurges against other State governments might be stirred up by the Communist opposition parties there, and they therefore counseled patience and recourse to democratic methods. But the struggle against the Communists in Kerala was carried out with rigorous adherence to Gandhiji's principles of *ahimsa* and *satyagraha* (non-violence and struggle for truth), and the popular desire for freedom and the ending of a two-year period of despotic rule could not be quelled. While the popular feeling ran high, it was mainly due to the skillful handling of the situation by the leaders of the opposition that they were able to channel these forces to a successful conclusion.

Why did the Communists forfeit the good will of the people after having been legitimately elected to power? The reasons are mainly two: the enigmatic working of the electoral system, and the bureaucratic tyranny of the Communist regime, which, under the influence of dialectic and class warfare, tried its best to liquidate every semblance of liberty and opposition in the State. Without taking into consideration the number of independent candidates and smaller parties vying for votes in the elections of 1957, there were really only three major parties that could hope for any substantial representation in the Assembly. The

largest and strongest of these was the Congress party; then came the Communists and a close rival to them, the Praja Socialist party. The democratic parties, viz., the Congress and the Praja Socialist party were disunited among themselves and perhaps a bit too sure of winning the elections.

On the other hand, the Communists worked hard to persuade the electorate in their favor. In India, there is no system of proportional representation as in Italy. In imitation of the British system, there are single-member constituencies in which the member with the highest number of votes obtains a seat in the State Assembly. In this way, it is quite possible that the member who has secured the seat with a bare majority of votes may not be representing the majority of the people who have voted in the constituency.

The Congress party contested in the elections 124 seats out of the 126 in the State Assembly, while the Communists contested only 100. The Congress party polled 2,256,712 votes out of a total of 5,907,802 votes cast or 38.2%, while the Communists polled at the same time 2,156,012 or 36.5%. Yet the Congress, after having contested 124 seats, won only 43, while the Reds contested 100 and won 60. The other seats in the Assembly were divided among 9 Praja Socialist party members, and 14 other smaller party groups. Had all the parties and the independent members united together against the Communists,

they could have forced them to resign. But it must be borne in mind that 5 independent candidates had been actively supported by the Communist party and so the Communists controlled in all 65 seats in a house of 126 seats.

The Communal groups that helped the Communists to power were the Ezhavas and the Depressed Classes, who gave the Communists some 1.4 million votes or about 70 per cent of the votes they gained. These people had been wooed into the Communist camp by the promise of special advantages for their communities after the centuries of exploitation they had suffered at the hands of the higher castes. Together, the Ezhavas and the Depressed Classes number about 30% of Kerala's population, and 90% of them went to the polls to vote for the Communists. But despite this solid backing, recent events prove that the vote that jockeyed the Communists into power was an anti-Congress vote rather than a pro-Communist one. The people were disgusted with the record of political rivalry, nepotism and chicanery of the other parties that had held power since the formation of the State, and either abstained from voting in favor of the Congress and the Praja Socialist party, or else voted for the Communists. Indeed while 90 per cent of the Ezhavas and the Depressed Classes cast their votes in the elections, only 70 per cent of the other communities bothered to go to the polls.

Once the Communists had captured the machinery of government

in Kerala, they did all they could without openly flouting the Constitution to entrench themselves in power. Indeed events in Kerala for the last two years are an excellent sample of the Communist tactic of shrouding violence and terror under legal formulae so as to destroy every vestige of opposition and criticism of their rule.

Immediately after the elections, an amnesty was granted to several prisoners, many of them former members of the Communist party, some of whom had been sentenced for serious crimes of violence against their fellow-citizens.

Government lands were thrown open to those who had no lands in the apparent attempt to keep the election promise of solving the problem of the rural proletariat. There was a rush for such lands, and in order to prevent the situation from deteriorating, a law was framed to prevent further seizure of such lands by the people. But the clauses of the law were cunningly devised so that only the first settlers who had occupied the land and before a fixed date were allowed to retain their holdings, and these were mainly Communists.

Since Communist ministers took charge of the portfolios of education, revenue, law, labor and home affairs, the important positions in the civil service were soon placed in the hands of party members. Similarly the police force was completely in Communist hands after some time, and the impartiality of the courts, that last bulwark of the

citizen's freedom, was nullified by the active interference of the Chief Minister in some of the decisions of the judges. Communist trade unions were favored by the Labor Minister, especially during the disturbances in the coffee and rubber plantations. Communist squatters on private lands were permitted to remain. When their owners objected, they were beaten by the police.

Gradually a feeling of insecurity and helplessness spread among the people. They realized that there was no impartial authority in the land to protect them against injustice. It was at this time that the Christopher movement came into being. Despite the name "Christopher," which suggests a witness-to-the-faith movement, the association also arose out of a real need on the part of the people to defend themselves against the violent and rowdy elements let loose by the government. Of course the Communists dubbed the movement as a "private militia" and said that it was a "national menace." But since, in India, arms and ammunition are only given to private persons on conditions of very strict licensing, it is difficult to understand the Communist accusations. The Christophers wore uniforms and carried the traditional Indian "lathi" or bamboo stick. It was their dress and disciplined behavior in public functions that focused upon them the attention of the people.

Nor were the efforts of the Communist government to run the State an improvement on those of their predecessors. On the contrary, it was

found that there was a general deterioration in the economy. The State exchequer had shown a surplus of Rs. 12.3 million in April 1957 before the Communists took over the government. But by the end of November 1958, the Communist government had to borrow a sum of Rs. 46.723 million from the Reserve Bank of India in the ways and means account.

Because of Government ineptitude, food production fell below the levels expected in Kerala. During the first Five-Year Plan period 1951-56, the food production in Kerala was estimated to have risen by 345,764 tons. This was achieved after spending 19 per cent of the total plan outlay of Rs. 300 million on agriculture and commodity development programs. This was before the Communists took over the State. The second Five-Year Plan that began in 1957 had apportioned Rs. 870 million for development in Kerala, the target for food production alone being a further increase of 3.49 million tons, for which Rs. 150 million had been set aside. Instead, the increase in the year 1957-58 had been only 9,000 tons. Similarly the improvement of irrigation had been negligible.

The result was a food famine in Kerala. This was partly due to the shameful rice deal of the government with the State of Andhra. It is now known that the Kerala government did not deal directly with the Andhra government but through some contractors in Madras, and therefore had to buy the rice at

higher prices than the terms normally offered by the Andhra government. It is suspected that through the rice deal, the Communist party's funds greatly benefited, but the government of Kerala refused to allow any official investigation of the scandal. However, the Central Government of India had to come to the aid of the people by supplying them with 196,000 tons of rice in December 1958, whereas before the monthly quota of rice to Kerala from the Center had been 25,000 tons.

The Education Bill

But what really unseated the party from power was the Education Bill. In India, there are government-owned and managed schools and privately owned and managed schools. Unlike the practice in Italy, where private schools receive no grants of aid from the government, in India private schools do receive substantial grants in aid from the State Department of Education. Obviously, those schools receiving grants of aid from government are expected to fulfill certain conditions of maintenance of proper school buildings, standards of teaching, adequate school equipment, etc. And they are therefore subject to inspection by the government.

In Kerala, in addition to State government inspection, the salaries of the teachers of the schools had to be deposited by the manager of the school with the government because there had been cases where teachers had been paid less than

what they were due according to government regulations. But the new Bill introduced by the Education Minister of Kerala contained certain clauses by which the manager could no longer appoint the teachers of his choice but had to employ them out of an approved list of teachers. All teachers would have to register their names and their qualifications with the Education Department and would then be assigned to schools as they were needed. Teachers from the minority and backward communities would be given representation on the list according to their numbers. Private agencies were thus permitted to hold and conduct high schools, but the appointment of the teachers or their transfer and dismissal were vested with the government, to be exercised through the Public Services Commission which would screen all teachers applying for employment in high schools.

Thus the government sought to provide itself with an opportunity of appointing as many Communist teachers as possible in the schools. Since the Public Service Commission was to be expanded from three to eight members who are irremovable except by the President of India, the government intended to appoint five full-blooded Communists or fellow-travellers to the Commission, thus ensuring its complete control over the teaching in the schools. The way for this cunning move had already been prepared when the textbooks to be used in the schools and prescribed by the

government had been subtly revised to extol the great achievements of Russia and China in the cultural, scientific and economic spheres, to praise their leaders, and attribute their success to their materialistic philosophy of life.

The strong public reaction to the bill can only be understood when it is realized that the Catholic community in Kerala owns and conducts about 1,500 schools. A section of the Hindu community called the Nairs has 3,500 schools, other Christian denominations less than 1,000, while the government itself conducts barely 2,000. Naturally the private agencies were up in arms against such legislation.

At first it was mainly the Catholics who perceived the dangerous trends in the bill, but when the Nairs came to realize the danger, their leader, Mannam Padmanabhan, threw in the weight of his great prestige with the Christian opposition. On representation from the Nairs and the Christians, certain clauses of the bill that violated the rights of minorities to hold and conduct schools as granted by the Constitution of India were referred by the President of India to the Supreme Court, but the judges were not convinced that the proposed bill infringed in any substantial way on the rights of the minorities, except that of the Anglo-Indians who had been guaranteed financial support by the Constitution for ten years from its commencement.

Of course the term "minority," when applied to the Nairs, who are

a part and parcel of the majority Hindu community in India, could not be used without ambiguity. On the other hand, the Constitution is quite clear that minorities may possess and conduct schools of their own to preserve their culture. But this provision of the Constitution was not ostensibly violated, because it was to *government-aided* schools, i.e., schools receiving financial assistance from the government, that the law would apply. If the minorities disliked the provisions of the law, they could conduct schools of their own, which would be "*recognized*" by the government, but would receive no financial aid.

The Communists, however, well knew that it would be impossible for the private agencies to conduct schools without the aid of the government, and so they would be forced to accept the injurious clauses of the bill and thus throw open their schools to Communist infiltration. The Education Act was published by the Kerala government on February 28, 1959, as an Extraordinary Gazette for the information of the public, after the President of India had given his consent to the bill with a few minor modifications.

But in forcing the unpopular Education Bill upon an unwilling public, the Communists sowed the seed of their own undoing, and were smothered by the fury of the opposition they had aroused. Undoubtedly the spearhead of the opposition was the Catholic community. Both hierarchy and laity participated in a wonderful display of

unified action that has rarely been witnessed before. Without the assistance of other anti-Communist sections of the people like the Nairs and the Muslims, however, the Catholics alone would have been powerless to achieve their objectives. According to available statistics, Christians in the State of Kerala number 3.5 million or 24 per cent of the population, while the Nairs number 2.4 million or 17 per cent, and the Muslims are 2.8 million in number, and form 20 per cent of the population of about 14 million. It was the united opposition of the Christians, the Nairs and the Muslims, numbering nearly 9,000,000 or 60 per cent of the people, and constituting among themselves the Congress, the Praja Socialist and the Muslim League parties that toppled the Communist ministry.

The Reds Toppled

It is not necessary to give here a detailed account of how the Communists were ousted from power. A brief description will suffice. The struggle began with the refusal on the part of the Christian management and the Nair Service Society to open their schools on June 1, 1959, when the new school year begins in Kerala, unless the Education Bill of the government was withdrawn. To cope with the situation, the government postponed the opening of the schools to June 15. But even on that day only government schools opened. Many of the students abstained from the classes and the schools were picketed.

Meanwhile the political opposition parties had on June 12 organized a very successful *hartal*, that brought all private activity in Kerala to a standstill. On June 13 all the District Collectors' offices in the State were picketed by opposition party volunteers, to mark what was known as "direct action" against the Communist government. Four persons were killed, when the police opened fire on crowds who encouraged the pickets.

From June 22-25 Pandit Nehru toured the State and came to the conclusion that the only way out of the impasse was fresh elections. On June 24 some of the bishops interviewed the Prime Minister and during the discussion made it clear that the outburst against the government was not sponsored solely by the Catholics, but by all parties in the State. The Communists refused to yield to any suggestions of resignation made by Mr. Nehru, nor would they allow an impartial inquiry into the various firing incidents that had occurred in the State.

On July 10, the opposition parties presented the President of India with a 50-page memorandum which detailed their grievances against the Communist government in Kerala. Nearly half the document was devoted to citing instances of alleged corruption and nepotism and cases of organized violence and discrimination brought before the courts.

Some of the main charges against the Communist government included corruption, deliberate violation of the principles of equality before

the law, withdrawal of cases pending against Communist party members and sympathizers, vindictive prosecution of members of the opposition parties, discrimination in administration by departments, establishment of cell courts, lawlessness in agrarian and labor fronts, increase in crime, demoralization of the services, bids to liquidate opposition workers, partiality in promotions and postings, victimization, disregard for official procedures, interference by party men, challenges to the independence of the Judiciary, bringing the Public Service Commission to the party line, totalitarianism in education, and last, but not least, abuse of the State finances.

The same memorandum was also submitted to the Governor of Kerala. Both the Central Cabinet and the Congress high command were deeply disturbed by the turn of events, but were unable to interfere actively in Kerala because they wished to abide by the Constitution. Finally, it was only when the Governor of the State handed in his confidential report to the President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, that the latter exercised the powers conferred on him by Art. 356 of the Constitution and issued a proclamation on the evening of July 31, 1959, assuming to himself "all functions of the government of Kerala, dissolving the State Legislative Assembly, and directing that general elections for constituting a new Legislative Assembly for the State be held as soon as possible." Thus was terminated the

27-month-old Communist government of Kerala.

The Future

But merely turning the Communist government out of office is not going to solve the problems of the State all at once. The situation in Kerala, as the opposition parties well realize, is plagued by three complex issues, a growing population, a scarcity of agricultural land, and the highest percentage of literates in India, which has worsened the problem of the educated unemployed.

In addition to these problems is the absence of industrialization, and the acute poverty of certain groups like the fisherfolk along the coast, the agricultural laborers, and those performing menial services. Until these problems are tackled energetically and realistically so as to provide opportunities of successful employment and a sufficiency of income for these people, no stable government that believes in democracy can stay for long in power in Kerala.

For the Catholic community in particular, a serious obligation arises of initiating and participating in projects of economic development that will insure employment and a higher income to those in acute need. Charity in the form of gifts of food or alms can serve to assuage social misery for the time being. More radical measures in the form of concrete plans of self-development through co-operatives, vocational training, community de-

velopment, vigilantly fostered and perseveringly carried through will yield the desirable result of keeping communism at bay. But this implies initial investments of capital, dynamic social inspiration and selfless devotion on the part of the leaders of the community, towards the achievement of a social organization where glaring inequalities of wealth will quickly disappear, where opportunities for improvement will be thrown open to all alike, and where employment and the standard of living of the lowest income groups will steadily appreciate. In a speech delivered recently in Rome, Mr. P. T. Chacko, the Catholic leader of the opposition party in the Legislature, declared that although most probably the Communists have small chances of winning the State elections to be held at the end of January, 1960, the new government will be faced with the same problems of acute unemployment, poverty, misery, and social exploitation that had unsettled the previous Communist government, and that unless measures were taken to fight these evils, there was every likelihood of the Communists returning in new strength to take over the government in 1961.

To successfully carry out the program outlined above, the opposition parties must strengthen the bonds of unity created by the common struggle against communism. Unfortunately, however, even within the Catholic community, there prevails disunity and divergence of views. The Catholics belong to three

different rites—the Syrian, the Malenkara, and the Latin. The Syrians were converted to the faith by St. Thomas himself and they are the largest and most advanced, educationally and financially, of the three groups. The Latins come second in importance. Many of them were formerly Syrians, but were induced through persuasion or through pressure by the first Portuguese missionaries in India to join the Latin rite. In time, such diversity has in Kerala proved to be an element of division: some members of one rite have gradually through the centuries allowed themselves to become a prey to feelings of suspicion and hostility towards those of other rites, and these hostile feelings have been aggravated by an ancient heritage of caste prejudice.

All the same, despite the divergences and suspicions that have unfortunately arisen, when the Church of Kerala has been threatened from without, the hierarchy and the laity have displayed a wonderful spirit of unity in the face of the common foe. What is now required is that such unity should not be restricted to periods of grave crises but should be fostered at all times.

This desirable result cannot be obtained in a day. It should begin with instructing the faithful in the meaning of the liturgy and its true place in the extension of the Church. The unitive mentality of a single universal Church must be developed in the minds of the faithful so that the Church can bend all her energies towards the fulfillment of being a

true leaven in modern society through her social program.

A final difficulty that has to be faced in Kerala is that despite the devotion of the people and their loyalty to the bishops and priests, not all is well with the laity. It is a sad fact that the Minister of Education and the Minister of Labor in the Communist government were formerly practicing Christians. These facts have to be faced squarely and the reasons for their existence discovered and remedied. It is quite possible that with the great advance of secular education, the layman may not find the priest sufficiently equipped to answer his difficulties. In Kerala there is but one major seminary for secular priests to cater to the needs of 15 dioceses. On the other hand, lay Catholic leaders, grounded in the principles of the faith and conscious of their obligations to manifest it boldly in the face of an unbelieving world, are not easy to find. The urgent need is for lay Catholics who can devote themselves fully to the service of interests of the Church and at the same time be relied upon by their pastors to defend Catholic faith and principle in the temporal sphere.

In the Communist struggle in Kerala, Catholic women for the first time in history made their appearance on the stage of public affairs. Never before had women been considered courageous or capable enough to leave their home and fight for their rights by the side of their menfolk. But an agelong tradition was broken when large parties

of women went to picket the government offices, suffered lathi charges and were carried off to prison. Thus the struggle in Kerala has given the Catholics an opportunity to leave their ghettos and to impress the non-Catholic world in India with their courage and determination to resist a totalitarian and unjust regime.

As the spearhead of the opposition to the Communist regime, the Catholic community has come into the limelight in India as a force that is molding and shaping the destinies of the country. In explaining to the Parliament in India why the Communist government in Kerala had been an astonishing failure, Mr. Nehru said that they had antagonized the Catholic Church, "which was a big force in Kerala" and had therefore to face the consequences. This is great praise indeed, but unless every effort is made by the Church to unite its forces in Kerala, its enemies will easily be able to weaken its resistance by exploiting the divisive potentialities within its ranks. The Catholic community must therefore do all it can to unite its forces quickly and energetically, take an active part in the political and civil life of the State, and especially carry out a program of planned development for the uplift of the poverty-stricken groups within its fold and within the State. This is the positive policy that needs implementing in the immediate future. It is the only safe road to the preservation of freedom and the democratic way of life.

The Freedom of the Press*

JOHN XXIII

WE ARE particularly pleased to welcome your distinguished gathering today, Beloved Sons, who claim the honorable and responsible title of Catholic jurists. You have come to Rome to celebrate together the 10th convention, one of a series of yearly meetings organized by your group. This denotes the seriousness of your duty and the constant fruitful diligence of your work, which is considerably productive.

We tell you, therefore, of Our great satisfaction with the program that you pursue with such competence and nobility of feeling. You are conscious of your lofty mission, and you wish to live it fully in the light of God and of a fearless conscience.

The word jurist indicates a highly qualified person, of noble steadfastness and sensitivity. It bespeaks a profound interior intellectual and moral formation which has penetrated to the roots of pensive youth in his fruitful and generous years; a formation that constantly renews itself in an effort of uninterrupted updating.

The word jurist also refers to the strict interpreter of the law, the guardian and defender of juridical principles, the tireless practitioner and fashioner of that development of the law which is anchored in the two tables of Divine Law, which finds its expression and confirmation in the natural law, fashioned by the creative hand of God in every human soul. The jurist gives further application of the commandments of this law to the specific cases of the limitless variety of life, and at the same time he deduces sanctions from the law, according to the image of that God who is a just, strong and wise judge (cf. Ps. 7:11).

Your position as convinced and practicing Catholics throws a special

*An address to a group of Italian Catholic jurists, December 8, 1959.

light on your mission, which We do not hesitate to describe as a real and lofty vocation. It finds its consecration and its crowning in the faithful adherence to the laws of God and His Church.

But a special proof of your seriousness of intention and of your work has been offered to Us by your congress' theme, which has attracted lively attention: "The Freedom of the Press in the Juridical Order." You have devoted your studies to this question for some time past, dedicating many and scholarly treatments in the specialized reviews published by your organization. This is one of the truly crucial points of today's social life, and We are grateful to you for having recalled it once again to the attention of the juridical world.

A long time ago, when We occupied the episcopal throne of St. Mark's, We had the responsibility of serving as president of the Tri-Veneto Episcopal Conference, and the idea occurred to Us then to devote a thoughtful and substantial document to the multiple problems of the press in the name of all the bishops of the Three Venices. And now the Lord has willed Us here and We continue to think of it often, for there pass before Us every day pages of printed material: dailies and periodicals, books and reviews, as well as reports on books and their evaluation from a religious and moral standpoint. In this respect We would like to tell you, with simplicity and paternal confidence, as one would a gathering of attentive and beloved sons, of a recollection of Ours. We keep in Our heart the memory of the simple and healthy environment in which the Lord wished Us to open Our eyes to the light of this world. From Our adolescence We found Ourselves immersed in a domestic and diocesan tradition that was always open to the knowledge of what is true and beautiful. It was a tradition friendly to the abundance of ancient and modern chronicles of regional life which illustrated the habits and customs of the people.

Returning in Our thoughts to the things seen and heard and the people encountered, We have the joy to say that in Our youth Our spirit was never offended by disconcerting sights, words or accounts, and We can therefore testify to the forthrightness, honesty and delicacy of conscience of Our family and Our people. Here We speak not only of the clergy and teachers with whom We came into contact, but also of the laity of various classes; yes, also the laity, whose fate it was to live in tempestuous and polemical times which were, in certain respects, of less favorable conditions than those in which the Catholic laity live today!

In the memory of the sound uprightness of those days, how can the Pope—who feels the burden of the spiritual responsibility entrusted to him, though his usual calm may hide from the eyes of the faithful the worries he has—how can he remain indifferent to the propagation of a chronicle, a publicity and a romanticized exhumation of history which have nothing to do with instruction and honest information? Will not his heart suffer at the thought of the poison that is administered with unrestrained detail to so many innocent people and to youth in their inexperience and in the confusion of their adolescent years, with accounts, exposés and illustrations which have nothing to do with the knowledge of truth, the attraction of what is good and the vision of what is beautiful, but which are clearly excluded from them?

Whoever has the duty of evaluating the things of this world according to the high criterion of the laws of God and of safeguarding the moral beauty of the soul cannot fail to recall solemnly those terrible words of Jesus: "Whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in me to sin, it were better for him to have a great millstone hung around his neck, and to be drowned in the depths of the sea. Woe to the world because of scandal! . . . but woe to the man through whom scandal does come!" (*Matt. 18:6-7*).

Norms for the Press

Because of these things We are emboldened, and with entreating voice and strong heart We submit to the attention of parents and educators, of statesmen, legislators and jurists, of publishers and industrialists these following points, trusting in their good will and rectitude:

1. One must above all have a clear conscience, constantly inspired to a right equilibrium, and not inclined to insensibility and laxism.

The right to truth and orientation toward an objective moral norm, founded on the lasting value of the divine law, is anterior and superior to every other right and demand. The freedom of the press must conform and discipline itself in this respect to the divine laws, which are reflected in human laws, just as the freedom of individuals is conformed and disciplined by positive precepts. And as it is not lawful for the free citizen—by the mere fact that he proclaims himself free—to do violence and bring damage to the freedom, property and life of his neighbor, so neither is it lawful for the press—under the pretext that it must be free—to assail daily and systematically the religious and moral well-being of mankind.

Every other requirement, whether of profit or dissemination of news, must be subject to these basic laws.

This clear conscience must be joined to the precise understanding of every man's proper mission. This mission is, in fact, not only informative but formative, and it therefore aims at giving an education. No one can deny that the organs of the press are not only means through which public opinion is expressed, but are also instruments of orientation and formation, and therefore sometimes instruments of the deformation of public opinion.

Now, education is none other than respect of human values, which is gradually formed, but which also can be upset if it is not sufficiently protected against sinful inclinations. This education, according to an ancient and still valid Socratic concept, is a drawing out of the intimacy of the human spirit so as to bring it to light, life and perfection: therefore it cannot be an injection of poison, a conscious enticement to evil inclinations, a contribution toward confusion, or indeed an oppressing and debasing of human dignity.

2. This clear conscience of itself invokes and assumes by its own action those due limitations which must restrain the rights of the press in respect, order and legality. These limitations are imposed upon the desire to speak of or treat a matter in a morbid fashion, upon the eagerness for the sensational and illicit. They are imposed upon the flattery of gain, upon inconsiderateness and levity which violently destroy the innocence of the child and the adolescent while they justify themselves with the claim that this is inevitable and fateful.

It is better to be explicit in this matter, without regard for what one would say out of human respect, so that there will be no connivance with complicity: It is not the love of knowledge, of culture and of truth that guides certain pens, but the unhealthy fire of certain passions and the immoderate desire for notoriety and gain which passes over the insistent appeals of the conscience.

Can it be lawful that one may blatantly offer details and descriptions to the cupidity of curiosity which should be reserved to police laboratories and the magistrature? Is it ever lawful to allow criminal deeds to become the occasion and incentive to vice, when it would be better to throw a veil of pity over these crimes?

Publicity itself, especially in certain fields, obeying nefarious rules, has assumed disconcerting and frightening aspects that cannot be justified except by the deliberate intention of violently affecting the senses

and penetrating the force of minds without concern for the wounds left on the soul.

The attentive examination of this painful situation must therefore lead the responsible authorities and offices to a logical and dutiful conclusion—that there must be necessary limitations in the exercise of the freedom of the press. And these limitations must be strictly determined on the basis of the law and through it, so that such a delicate, important and decisive field for the future of every nation may not be left to the mercy of improvisation, feeble self-control, of which much has been said; or worse, to the mercy of bad faith and deceit.

It is up to you also, beloved sons who have made this the object of study and constructive action during this convention, to apply the contribution of your doctrine and also your authority as Catholic jurists to the solution of this very serious problem.

3. Finally, there must be clear-cut positions and a positive program.

By natural disposition of mind We do not like to apply—and only rarely do We apply—strong expressions to the multiple situations of social life. We do so only when We feel confident that they can be improved. But in this case We feel the need to say everything, and to confide Our anxieties and Our hopes to those who are Our friends and brothers—brothers because of the practice of the Catholic Faith and also because of the mutual sincere and human feeling we share on this matter of the degenerating press and the valuation made of writers worthy of the name.

The firm positions required of Catholics are therefore as follows: not to have fear of being silenced as “scrupulous” and exaggerators in their attitude of disapproval of a certain press. Hence, not to buy, nor credit, nor favor or even speak of the perverse press. Not to fear to avail oneself of every means of channeling this sector toward a human and civilized discipline, even before channeling it toward a Christian discipline. It is the Catholics who are called principally to this work of defense and firmness and also all those who have an honest conscience and a sincere desire to be useful to society, because in this field above all one should feel the seriousness of the sin of omission.

As for the positive program to be followed: After noting how legislation has made gigantic progress in the defense of the rights of the human person, it must be agreed that the same cannot be said regarding the press. Yet also here it is a question of a fundamental right that concerns personal freedom: and “the protection of this freedom,” as was

stressed by Our predecessor Pius XII in 1947, "is the aim of every juridical order worthy of that name . . . One would legalize licentiousness if one allowed the press . . . to undermine the religious and moral foundations of the life of the people. One need not even be Christian to understand and accept this principle. The use of reason and of a sound moral and juridical sense, undisturbed by passions, is enough" (*Discourses and Radio Messages*, Vol. VIII, Jan. 8, 1947, p. 369).

Now the scope of the many congresses and individual meetings treating of studies and publications should be to enlighten, convince and clear the air on these questions.

The responsibility with which each person feels himself invested will be for men of science—as well as for all people of good will and lucid mind—a great incentive to act quickly and well, to move promptly and with a spirit of apostolate.

The love of truth, the constancy of one's own convictions and sincere zeal for souls will be an impetus for all those who have at heart the honor of the Church and the salvation of society. May this program be enlivened for you by the words of the Apostle: "And in doing good let us not grow tired; for in due time we shall reap if we do not relax. Therefore, while we have time, let us do good to all men, but especially to those who are of the household of faith" (*Gal. 6:9-10*).

Beloved Sons! We have acquainted you with Our profound anxieties and worries, and having done so has afforded Us some relief, like a person who has rid himself of a weight burdening his soul: "dixi et liberavi animam meam" (I have spoken and unburdened my soul). And We are now comforted by the thought that We find in you a full understanding of the seriousness of the problems, together with a willing intention of remedying them.

Continue with your studies and with the light of good example that you give. We invoke upon you the fullness of divine gifts through the maternal intercession of the Immaculate Virgin, Mother of Good Counsel, so that you may be sustained in your labors, encouraged in good will and be given serenity of conscience.

As a token of the heavenly favors, We are happy to impart to you, as well as to the worthy president, all the members of the Union of Italian Catholic Jurists and to the people dear to you, the propitiatory Apostolic Benediction.

Censorship*

JOHN XXIII

WE ARE happy to give you an affectionate welcome, Beloved Sons, censors of books, who conclude your Congress in Rome with the present meeting. We salute you as an elite rank of scholarly priests, to whom is entrusted an exceedingly delicate task, and who, therefore, are distinguished by an attractive blending of proven abilities. It is with good reason that the Code of Canon Law requires you to be "of mature age, of tried learning and prudence" (Can. 1393, No. 3), and it is in the light of such a definition that We are pleased to express to you Our fervent appreciation.

You carry out in the world of books a work which is patient, silent and balanced. Under the direction of your Ordinaries, which places upon your conscience the responsibility for watchfulness, you defend and propagate sound doctrine. This labor is directed toward the uncovering of genuine Christian and human values and the firm and loyal reproofing of errors and dangerous attitudes.

Your work is an occasion for hard labor and continuous anguish, not only because it requires a sacrifice of time as well as an expenditure of physical energy, but also above all because a grave responsibility weighs heavily upon your efforts and accompanies you as a driving stimulus, reminding you of the numerous consciences which the Ecclesiastical Authority has entrusted to your judgment, to indicate to them a moral rule and a sure criterion to follow. The mission which you carry out is, in this sense, of the highest worth, because you participate in the maternal solicitude of the Church in guiding and instructing her own children in the knowledge of truth and in shielding them from every error.

Already Our predecessor Pius XII of venerable memory, in the audience granted to ecclesiastical reviewers in February 1956, defined their position as being collaborators of the Church in the "work of

*An address to a group of ecclesiastical book censors, November 18, 1959.

ministry" (*Eph.* 4:12), saying, "in each of you We seem to recognize a worthy and faithful cooperator in Our pastoral ministry" (*Discourses and Radio Messages*, XVII, 1955-56). These words should tell you even more that you should be precious instruments and faithful collaborators of your Ordinaries and, therefore, collaborators of the ecclesiastical authority in the service of truth, for the safeguarding of the patrimony of the Faith and of morals, which must be handed down intact to coming generations.

In the field in which you carry out your activity there has been constant progress in recent years which one may regard with serene appreciation, although one must take note of certain defects which may be encountered.

Beloved Sons! What is your duty in such a condition in which one finds such a contrast of lights and shadows? We are quite aware of the difficulties which can often misguide you and discourage you in your work. But, if on the one hand it is dangerous for you to be disheartened by the less consoling side of the picture, it would on the other hand be no less damaging for you to give way to an easy optimism which could lead to dangerous compromises and negotiations with the risk of doing harm to the sacred deposit of doctrine and the souls of the faithful.

The Need for Realism

It is necessary, therefore, that you possess a sane realism which does not forget the condition of human nature wounded by original sin. This, however, cannot become detached from an apostolic urge, dictated by profound zeal, remembering how it was said by the Divine Savior: "A bruised reed he will not break, a smoking wick he will not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory" (*Matt.* 12:20; cf. *Is.* 42:3).

The ecclesiastical reviewer must not permit himself to adopt an intransigent hardness which tears down but does not rebuild, which discourages but does not reanimate, which saddens but does not lead to repentance. He will, moreover, avoid every tendency to hastiness of judgment so that his work be distinguished by intelligence, sensibility and discernment, in a clear view of his own tasks, in the faithful service of the ecclesiastical authorities. To this purpose it is useful to recall that the cited canon requires ecclesiastical censors to "take the golden mean in approving or rejecting doctrines." Your work must therefore be

inspired to a correct equilibrium by indicating firmly but gently the ways of justice.

These characteristics are summed up in a well-known maxim, attributed to different authors but nonetheless precious and useful. We recalled it in Our first encyclical, but We think it fitting to apply it also to your work: "In essentials, unity; in doubtful matters, freedom; in all things, charity."

This "unity" has its meaning in the inviolable sanctity of religion, which one must uphold and defend against every fickle change of the times. It is therefore a guarantee of order and security, but at the same time it communicates a marvelous and invincible force to our undertakings.

The ecclesiastical reviewer, being inspired to such a duty of unity, should first of all possess as thorough a knowledge as possible of Catholic dogmatic and moral theology, of Patristics and ecclesiastical tradition, and of the papal teachings. Subsequently, he should conform to them in their application to concrete cases, with seriousness, discipline and scrupulous care, with an eye to the common good. Thus a diversity of judgment will be avoided which could lead to confusion and dangerous disorientation.

The "freedom" which we have indicated above is that which one trusts to the conscience and good sense of the reviewer, to his maturity of judgment and promptness of orientation. In a field so varied and elastic as cultural and literary production provides, where the most diverse and unforeseen situations of human existence are presented in a brilliant cover of artistic form, it is very important to know how to move with ease, not only in picking out the positive aspects and underlining the negative aspects, but also in conducting oneself wisely in determining how best to arrive at a more precise understanding of doctrinal and moral positions.

Finally, but above all things else, "charity," the queen of virtues in which are summed up the teaching and practice of the law (cf. Rom. 13:8). It preserves judgment from the danger of coldness and contempt, and it tempers a possible severity with the sweet delicacy which inspires minds. The characteristics which St. Paul attributes to this virtue in his immortal eulogy can also find their actuation in your work: "Charity is patient, is kind: charity does not envy, is not pretentious, is not puffed up, is not ambitious, is not self-seeking, is not provoked; thinks no evil, does not rejoice over wickedness, but rejoices with the truth"

(*I Cor.* 13:4-6). The charity which should inspire you certainly must not diminish your love for the truth. Here once again one can take sure direction from the exhortation of St. Paul: "Practice truth in love" (*Eph.* 4:15).

These, beloved sons, are the thoughts and exhortations which occurred to Us when We considered this audience, and We have wished to communicate them to you simply. We trust that you have been inspired by them and that, reconfirmed in your proposals, you will draw renewed comfort from them for the continuance of your hard and delicate labor with calmness and prudence.

We can but accompany you with Our devoted prayer, with which We invoke copious and continuous lights from Heaven upon your minds and your efforts. And in the hope that you draw from your Congress every favorable fruit for your future activities, in pledge of divine favors, We impart to you Our paternal and propitiating Apostolic Blessing.

• • •

U.S. Foreign Aid: A Christian Position*

CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

A MAJOR problem of our time is the growing competition between contending routes to "the good society" for the minds and hearts of the people of the less-developed countries of the world. The problem is made compellingly urgent by the widening gulf between the well-being of some and the vital insufficiencies of others.

For the less-developed countries the problem emerges as a matter of judging the relative compatibility of their own national aspirations with the pluralist course of development offered by free societies and, alternatively, with the totalitarian pattern presented by communism. For the United States, the problem is fundamentally that of an effective identification of its national interest with the revolutionary new national aspirations and expectations which serve the purpose of promoting world peace based on justice and the rule of law.

*A policy statement by the Committee on Economic Life, C.A.I.P., 1312 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington 5, D.C. May 8, 1959.

There are two aspects to this primary objective of the United States, one negative and hopefully short-term in its current scope and magnitude, the other positive and long-term. The negative or static aspect involves measures designed to assure our national survival by maintaining a balance of military power through adequate defense and military alliances. The positive or dynamic aspect embraces those measures and policies whose motivation is to promote social justice proportionately to our moral responsibility and capacity to do so, through various forms of economic assistance. While it is in the underdeveloped countries that the future alignment of political power may ultimately be decided, this objective should be ours even without considerations of power.

The need for military assistance to our allies is more self-evident to the American people than is the need for economic assistance to the less-developed countries, whether or not allies. Accordingly, the Economic Life Committee of the CAIP respectfully submits the following recommendations for the consideration of the Draper Committee in formulating its final report.

1. That there be an adequate military assistance program designed to promote the mutual defense of the United States and its allies.

A strong defense posture is indispensable in providing the shield without which other measures would be futile. Security for ourselves and our allies is of fundamental importance to our leadership role and to the success of our aims of social justice. Mutual Security is, therefore, a valid concept. So long as there exists a major threat to the peace of the world by military aggression and armed subversion, the United States must continue to furnish military assistance, including defense support, to its allies where such assistance and support is provided on the basis of need and military effectiveness and clearly serves military, strategic purposes.

It is understood that military assistance in some countries is given for political rather than military purposes, but on several grounds it would seem undesirable to give military assistance to an underdeveloped country if it does not serve a military end.

Where military assistance has the effect of keeping an unpopular or oppressive regime in power, the United States seemingly aligns itself with reactionary elements and acts contrary to the demands of social justice. In such cases it would appear impossible, through such aid, to have any substantial effect on the governments in the direction of social reform

and economic development; their policies may even run counter to these vital objectives.

Substantial military assistance frequently disrupts the local economy by distorting the production pattern and by generating inflationary pressures, producing further social injustice. To the extent inflation and misdirection of production result, the economy will be weakened and the country will become increasingly dependent on external assistance. Such a result is contrary to our objective, which is to foster national independence based on economic strength. Economic growth which results only from external assistance is not self-sustaining. Economic strength reflects a condition which may result from external assistance in part, but which becomes manifest in a country's ability to sustain balanced growth primarily through the intelligent use of its own resources. The United States may not lose the world contest with totalitarianism because some underdeveloped countries have a few divisions less; it may eventually lose this struggle if such countries are unable to achieve sustained growth through effective participation in the free world economy.

2. That the Mutual Security Program (MSP) should be restricted to military assistance, including limited defense support; and economic assistance should be enacted in separate legislation on a long-term, continuing basis.

The differing objectives of the two programs require this separation. By lumping programs having such different objectives into one piece of legislation, the statements made in support, and the thinking, too, of our national leaders, become confused and misunderstood both by the American public and by the countries which are the object of our efforts. On the one hand, statements have been made stressing that the program as a whole is the most economical way to assure our national security; this kind of thinking is larded through the hand-books and pamphlets put out by the Executive Branch to win public support for the total program. On the other hand, United States Government officials have asserted that we have placed too much emphasis on the cold war aspects of our aid program and too little on our moral responsibilities to the underdeveloped countries.

Security is one of those all-encompassing terms which is subject to various interpretations. The American people are only too apt to understand security in the limited sense of our military security, and fail to understand that economic aid to a given country has any relevance to

our security in any other sense. It is for this reason that it is important to distinguish between military aid programs and the economic-aid programs designed to promote sustained economic growth and stable, viable economies. Both promote United States security, but in rather different ways. Whether India, for example, is lost to the free world by revolution resulting from economic collapse or from external conquest, the results are equally damaging to our ultimate security.

Economic aid no longer rides on the coattails of military assistance, because Congress over the years has shown a greater capacity to distinguish the one from the other. Indeed, it appears that it will be increasingly difficult to justify the necessary magnitude of economic assistance, whether lumped together with military spending or not, unless a better case is made for it on its own distinctive merits to gain the widespread support of the American people.

3. That the objectives of economic assistance to low-income countries should emphasize the national purpose of the United States to further the ends of social justice in the world community.

Foreign economic assistance should clearly manifest our positive national purpose as being motivated by our sense of moral obligation in the name of social justice, a factor unfortunately obscured by the present structure of MSP. As a country blessed with an abundance of resources, we must recognize economic aid as simply our particular contribution toward the enhancement of the common good or general welfare of the community of nations. Economic assistance should therefore be channeled to underdeveloped countries, whether allied with us or not, for the primary purpose of promoting their social and economic development.

Success in promoting economic development and social justice in a given country might well lead to a broader measure of social and political stability. Otherwise, revolution and other political change may render our total foreign policy objectives ineffective—an economic-social-political outflanking of our strategic positions, e.g., Iraq.

Our national purpose should recognize the logical implications of this concept which comprehends the vital aspirations of the people in the less-developed areas. The people in these areas would, as a consequence, be much less inclined to see the United States effort as a cloak for a new colonialism. As things now stand, it looks to many of these people (with the aid of Communist propaganda) that we are motivated in all our aid programs solely by concern for our national security, and not for the social progress of the people of the poorer nations. Thus we

appear to be defenders of the status quo, as running against the grain of history in a revolutionary epoch. Henry A. Kissinger stated this point aptly in the *New York Times Magazine* of March 22, 1959, ". . . ultimately the unity of the West depends on what we affirm rather than on what we reject. It must flow from our convictions and hopes, not our fears."

Economic assistance is expected to contribute to economic growth. It is a fact that as countries grow economically, they raise the volume of their imports. Thus American exporters, as well as the exporters of other countries, will in time benefit as aid leads to higher income in underdeveloped countries and consequently to a higher level of world trade.

4. That social and fiscal reforms necessary to further the ends of social justice and sound development should be pursued vigorously.

If the United States were to demand certain basic reforms as a condition of its aid, as has been suggested, it would be considered an infringement of the aid-receiving country's sovereignty. Yet without these reforms economic aid is apt to be futile. If, as suggested in this paper, the United States has no political objective in its economic assistance program other than the furtherance of social justice and helping the underdeveloped countries maintain their freedom and independence, it may be more feasible for a multilateral organization to exert influence for the necessary reforms. A precedent for this sort of arrangement exists in the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), which have made recommendations for fiscal reforms to member countries which would be extremely difficult for a single government to make.

In short, while the aid programs would continue to be programmed and administered bilaterally, the agency charged with setting the preconditions to aid—land reforms, equitable tax structures, regulation of private business and finance, controls over the banking system, and the like—would be a multilateral agency with a degree of autonomy comparable to that of the IMF or the IBRD.

In a few cases, the country's leadership will want the reforms and will accept United States technical aid in carrying them out or may "reluctantly accept" the United States recommendations for steps which they would find politically difficult to take on their own. Since our aid has significant effect on the distribution of wealth and power within an aided country, we must take responsibility for encouraging reform wherever required.

The possibility of making assistance available to, or with the participation of, regional organizations for economic cooperation and integration should also be explored. The success of the European Recovery Program resulted largely from the fact that the Organization for European Economic Cooperation was established for the express purpose of co-ordinating United States economic aid and the trade, monetary and investment policies of the member countries, with a view to achieving the most effective results from the use of aid. The O.E.E.C. example has not yet been followed in programming aid to other parts of the world. Its usefulness as an instrument for promoting sound economic policies which cannot be dealt with bilaterally by the United States should be given serious consideration.

5. *That an inseparable part of our foreign program should be a more effective communication of United States objectives in the economic assistance program, both here and in the overseas information program.*

The words "democracy" and "freedom" mean quite different things to various people. In our usage, their meaning is ultimately linked with our own Western cultural traditions and national prosperity. Social justice is a more universal concept. It is clearly the implied goal in the basic writings of our national philosophy, and can easily be given a concrete meaning in underdeveloped areas, where it takes the form of educational opportunities, land reforms, wider distribution of income, and the putting of property to socially desirable uses. Extravagant consumption in the midst of abject poverty, for example, is at once a grave social injustice and an impediment to economic growth.

We should be able to demonstrate to the people in the less-developed countries that Christian moral philosophy on the social use of property underlies much of our legislation. Such things which we take for granted as our progressive income and inheritance taxes, public housing programs, and public education are all illustrative of this social philosophy which we are either too timid or inarticulate to tell the people in these countries.

Americans are a pragmatic people, averse to thinking in abstract terms. Our message to the underdeveloped nations must be related to their culture, experience, and problems. We must find a way to convey to them the true idealism inherent in our way of life, an idealism that motivates many Americans to support the continuation of foreign aid. In explaining our objectives and national purpose, we should point out that these are the things we advocate and practice in the United

States and that we are ready and willing to help local leaders achieve the same things. By stressing the extension of economic aid as a moral responsibility, the United States will best assure the attainment of our basic political objectives, namely to promote world peace based on justice and the rule of law.

• • •

The World Refugee Year*

N.C.W.C.

WORLD REFUGEE YEAR began last July on a note of high hope for the homeless refugees of the world. His Holiness Pope John XXIII added his voice to the chorus of those earnestly seeking to remind nations of their obligations:

We raise Our voice on behalf of refugees, and We paternally exhort all Our children in every part of the world to collaborate generously and efficaciously in making a success of this World Refugee Year, an undertaking inspired by aims so noble and disinterested, to which it pleases Us to pay tribute.

The earliest records of history indicate that migration and resettlement are common occurrences in the life of men. People move from their native land for various reasons. Some seek opportunity and adventure. Others flee from the disasters of nature, or of war and the aftermath of war. In many instances the tyranny of rulers, or economic and political pressures, or religious and social tensions force countless families to seek new homes in distant lands.

Migration is as much a part of current history as of past history. In the present-day world there are two groups of potential migrants, those forced to flee as refugees and displaced persons and those who emigrate voluntarily.

Those who are refugees and displaced persons have lost their homes because of war, persecution, or political pressures. Some are refugees from Communist persecution. Others are expelled, or subjected to intolerable pressure, as minority groups in a highly nationalistic society.

*A statement issued by the Administrative Board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C.

The second group of potential migrants comprises those seeking better living conditions or aspiring to a more abundant life. Even in relatively prosperous nations of Western Europe there are millions who either lack work or who barely subsist on the products of their labor, however diligent. In Asia, Africa and Latin America there are literally millions living in sheer destitution. They do not have even the utter minimum of food, shelter, clothing and medical care needed for a truly human life.

Any assertion that migration is the ultimate solution for all refugees or for the economically destitute can certainly be challenged. In many instances, vigorous and realistic plans for economic development might more effectively serve the purpose of aid. The fact remains, however, that great numbers of these people understandably clamor for the chance to seek a new home where they can more adequately meet their needs and those of their families. Their plea and their plight should be heard and examined in the light of Christian principles.

A Christian Attitude Toward the Problem

The attitude of the Christian toward his fellow man is based on the second of the two great laws of God, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Christ Himself insisted on love of neighbor as essential to the life of His followers. He even singled it out as a test for salvation:

If anyone says, "I love God," and hates his brother, he is a liar. For how can he who does not love his brother, whom he sees, love God, whom he does not see? And this commandment we have from him, that he who loves God should love his brother also. (*I John 4:20*)

Love of neighbor is fundamental and it must transcend nation, race, creed and status.

From this principle spring the basic moral considerations for formulating national policy on behalf of potential migrants in other countries. True love of neighbor will motivate us to assist these people in attaining the measure of justice that is rightfully theirs and to share with them in charity the temporal abundance God has given us.

Migration is a right due in justice to the individual. Pope Pius XII spoke of the "natural right of the individual to be unhampered in immigration or emigration." It is the right of human beings to have access to the resources of the earth created by God for the good of man. In the present order of things it is necessary for nations to make laws to insure the use of these resources in a reasonable and orderly fashion,

but the tenor of the law should be such as to facilitate, not impede, access to them.

It must be recognized, however, that migration is not the only solution, nor always the best solution for the problem of poverty in over-crowded lands. True, for many of those who are refugees and displaced persons there is no other hope but migration. Those, however, who are victims of disrupted economic and social conditions may prefer to remain in their homeland if these conditions are improved. A few years ago, for example, the world was deeply concerned about refugees and expellees from East Germany and from German lands now occupied by other powers. Today many of these persons have been absorbed by a prospering West German economy. On the other hand, in some countries such as Italy, Greece, the Netherlands, and Japan there is no apparent prospect in the immediate future for an expansion of the economy sufficient to provide a decent livelihood for all of their people. Accordingly, the nations of the world, especially those that are prosperous, should unite in effective long-range programs designed to raise productivity and thus make such nations as self-supporting as possible.

Sometimes migration is impossible because of the sheer numbers involved. Also migration is slow and in the meantime many millions are destitute, homeless and hungry. Here the obligation of charity, love for neighbor, strikes directly at the Christian conscience. The plight of these people cannot be ignored. Each nation, in a manner commensurate with true ability and wealth, must provide needed food, shelter, clothing and medical care. To neglect these people is to neglect the human family.

To summarize, migration is an absolute need for many refugees and displaced peoples. It is a solution for economic and social pressures in some areas where there seems to be little hope for internal economic and social improvement. But when migration becomes an impractical solution because of the sheer numbers involved, then heroic measures must be taken to alleviate present misery and to institute long-range reforms, designed to raise the standard of living.

The moral principles just stated, and the applications outlined above, have special relevance for a nation such as ours which is so lavishly blessed with God's bounty. Our obligation is fourfold: to share our own abundance; to welcome the immigrant; to promote and cooperate with world policies of resettlement; and to aid underdeveloped nations.

There is no need to restate here completely our record in this regard. Traditionally we have been generous in helping others in need. Until

recent decades, we have been relatively liberal in accepting immigrants. In present restrictive immigration laws, we have made exceptions for refugees and displaced persons. Since World War II, our aid to nations and peoples in distress has been extensive indeed.

Even though our record has been good, it is, nevertheless, not inappropriate to conduct a careful examination of the needs of the world to see whether we have done all within our power to aid the homeless and the hungry. The following questions might legitimately be raised:

1. Have we made a sufficiently urgent effort to develop to the fullest extent possible a program for distributing our food surpluses to the hungry? The difficulties involved are formidable, ranging from the political to the purely logistic. But could not these difficulties be overcome, were we determined to do so?
2. Are we meeting, according to our abilities and needs of other nations, the demands for technical assistance, development loans, and stimulation of private investment in newly developing nations? Should we increase our efforts to influence other comparatively wealthy nations to associate with us in international programs of this type?
3. Are we doing all within our power, particularly during this World Refugee Year, to help the refugee and displaced person? Could we do more in accepting the homeless within our own borders, or in helping them to find homes elsewhere in a suitable or desirable environment?
4. Do our own laws tend to discriminate against the "difficult to resettle" and "hardship" cases? Many students of our immigration laws feel they are designed to favor the best educated, the strongest, and the healthiest immigrants. This in effect bleeds a nation troubled with population problems of its best citizens, leaving behind those who can contribute least to national prosperity. Such ungenerous laws seem to bespeak a spirit of selfishness rather than a genuine desire of a privileged people to help those in need.
5. Are our basic laws sufficiently sensitive to problems of compassion, such as reuniting of families or the provision of homes for orphan children?
6. Are we observing the precepts of justice and charity by keeping in our laws prejudicial elements such as token quotas for Orientals or a national-origins clause? Do not these laws in effect favor nations whose people show the least desire for emigration?
7. Have we considered the possibility that some regulations designed to keep out criminals and subversives may affront the human dignity

of immigrants not belonging to this category? Could we not find less offensive methods for securing the same purpose?

8. Is the total number of quota immigrants too low, considering the immense economic strength of our nation? It is certainly no kindness to admit immigrants if there are no jobs available, but the ability of our economy to offer jobs has steadily and vigorously risen. Even doubling the present effective quota immigrant level would be an insignificant factor in adding to our work force.

9. Is our effort to help the immigrant adjust adequate to the problem? Could we not display warmer understanding toward him in his struggle with the new and complex difficulties involved in the process of social assimilation?

These questions are raised to stimulate Christian thinking on the concrete problems connected with migration and immigration. They are raised at a time when most Americans are acutely aware of the sacrifices they are making, especially in the form of taxes to meet the costs of national defense and an expanding population. The burdens we have been carrying are admittedly heavy, especially since they have been prolonged over many years, but sacrifice is essentially comparative. How many of us, even with heavy taxes and extensive programs of aid, are deprived of luxuries and possibly some comforts? There are few employed Americans whose lot is not incomparably better than that of the overwhelming majority of workers in the rest of the world. When we realize that a great portion of the world's population goes to bed hungry each night and that preventable disease is endemic in whole countries, we know that our sacrifices are relatively minor.

In the light of these problems the thoughtful Christian will read again the words of our Saviour:

I was hungry and you gave me to eat;
I was thirsty and you gave me to drink;
I was a stranger and you took me in;
naked and you covered me;
sick and you visited me;
I was in prison and you came to me . . .
Amen I say to you, as long as you did it for one of these,
the least of my brethren, you did it for me.

(Mt. 25:35-40)

Many CLOISTERED CARMELITES, members of the same Order as St. Thérèse of Lisieux, lack sufficient food and clothing. Convents are in deplorable condition. New methods of livelihood must be developed to enable them to support themselves. Would you be interested in assisting a Cloistered Carmelite?

**CLOISTERED
CARMELITE FUND**

c/o

Fr. Bellarmine Wilson, O. Carm.
29 North Broadway
Joliet, Ill.

Now available in Pamphlet form

**RELIGIOUS
TOLERANCE**
in Catholic Tradition

by Giacomo Cardinal Lercaro

The Cardinal archbishop of Bologna here elaborates on a theology of tolerance as represented in the Catholic tradition. Originally published in Documentation Catholique, Paris, France, this translation was made for the *Catholic Mind*. The appearance in English was welcomed by American students of this social question. Speaking of the need for a more fully developed theology of religious tolerance, Cardinal Lercaro argues for it to be one based not on a compromise with the spirit of the times but on traditional Catholic principles.

10¢ each when ordered in quantities
of 10 or more; single copy 15¢

(Please send remittance with orders
for \$3.00 or less)

Order a supply today!

THE AMERICA PRESS
920 Broadway, New York 10, N.Y.

**ENCYCLICALS
in handy form**

- For Study Clubs
- For Personal Reference

Reconstructing the Social Order	
Pius XI	25¢
The Holy Spirit	25¢
Leo XIII	25¢
The Mystical Body	25¢
Pius XII	25¢
The Sacred Heart	15¢
Pius XII	15¢
The Sacred Liturgy	40¢
Pius XII	15¢
The African Missions	
Pius XII	15¢
The Unity of Human Society	
Pius XII	25¢
Christian Education of Youth	
Pius XI	25¢
Films, Radio and TV	
Pius XII	25¢
33 1/3% discount on orders for 10 or more copies	
Order your supply today!	

AMERICA PRESS
920 Broadway, New York 10, N.Y.